The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THE Season's Greetings to our contributors and reviewers, our publishers and printers, and especially to our readers, with warm thanks for their support and their patience during sixteen years.

* * *

"MERCY! Hold! Enough!" We never thought the time would come when we should cry these words in regard to books. But this quarter the pelting has never ceased. From north, south, east, and west have they come, until the eyes rebel, the brain whirls, and even the body grows bruised with fatigue. One day a cairn of books will be found, with the epitaph, "He was read to death".

And so many of the books have been good. At the "Book Fair" and elsewhere we have been told of the huge amount of trash being published. That may be so, but we are much more impressed with the excellent quality of much of the work of the present day. Theology, biblical criticism, history, biography, *belles lettres*, big books, little books: this quarter has produced first-class examples of all these, and we can only hope that they will receive the attention they deserve. The reviewer can only feel apologetic as he handles such books, many of which deserve an article's space to themselves. The extra sixteen pages which we have often had to give in January becomes an absolute necessity this year, disinclined as we are to give it because it adds not only to our printing costs but to our postage bill. If our readers would but express their appreciation of this extra by securing new subscribers sufficient to meet it, it would be good business. May we appeal to ministers especially to help us in this way? Laymen are constantly writing to say that they would certainly have taken the *C.Q.* had they known of its existence (this is the way editors are kept humble). Will ministers please let us have the names of men and women in their congregations to whom we can send a specimen copy? A personal word is worth a ton of circulars.

* * *

WHAT can be said about the European Crisis? Perhaps little to advantage, for the situation to-day is very different from what it was even at the time of the Munich agreement, and may have changed altogether by the time these words are read. We have written so much at different times during the quarter that were it all printed the Editorial Notes would occupy all the journal! These brief para-

graphs are in the nature of "Crisis Notes" leaving room for some expressions of opinion from abroad.

In the Assembly of the Congregational Union at Bradford a resolution was drafted after much heart-burning which the Assembly passed unanimously. Few were satisfied with all its terms, but it succeeded in representing and combining adequately the different points of view. The resolution will be as futile as resolutions usually are unless those who voted for it, and the churches they represent, mean the dedication to the cause of peace it contains and are prepared to serve and sacrifice to the extent men do in time of war. In this dedication Christians of all opinions can share, just as they shared in the intense relief on the part of all, though some were mainly thankful, and others felt most a shame and humiliation they had rarely, if ever, known before. With all our resolutions and thanksgivings do we really intend to give ourselves to warfare for peace? Here is a business man—a Christian—who in the days before the Crisis loudly deplored that he was being ruined owing to the uncertainty. His business waned, his investments lost one-fifth their value. He prayed earnestly that war should not break out, and gave God thanks when it was averted. The wheels of his business began to turn, his investments recovered their fall. Should not his first step have been, especially as he admits that he would probably have lost everything had war broken out, to give this unearned increment, received, as he declared, because of prayer, to God, the poor, or the refugees? He has not done so, nor have the wealthier clergy and ministers. Their thanks have been voluble, their sacrifice nil, often measured by a guinea to the Lord Mayor's Fund for the Czechs. Peace will only be ours when our sacrifices for it are commensurate with the losses that would have been ours in case of war.

* * *

CHRISTIANS have rarely been so divided on a matter of public policy as they were at the time of the Crisis. The differences were reflected in all sections, even on our own Editorial Board. Many, believing that Mr. Chamberlain had saved the world from war, considered that this positive gain outweighed all other considerations, for he secured an opportunity to work for peace. Therefore the Government must be supported to give the policy of appeasement a chance. Others, believing that the supineness of the Government brought the world to the verge of war, and that the Munich Agreement merely strengthened the Dictators for future aggression, argued that had Mr. Chamberlain remained firm for another twenty-four hours, not merely would there have been no war, but that the beginning of the end would have come for the Dictatorships and their brutalities. Sincere and thoughtful people take these opposing points of view and all shades of opinion between.

* * *

For Mr. Chamberlain and his Cabinet *Goliath: the Growth of Fascism* (Gollancz, 16s.) should be compulsory reading. Its author, Prof. G. A. Borgese, formerly a Milanese Professor and journalist, writes with Italy specially in mind, and his chapter, "England Defaults", makes painful reading, even though the bitterness with which he writes be admitted. The title of the book suggests that once any David confronts the Dictators their doom is assured. The signs are that this view is justified. Dr. Borgese marvels at Britain's failure to read Mussolini's psychology: he never attacks but when he is safe and his advantage is overwhelming. During the Abyssinia crisis he shouted "Sanctions mean war", but when sanctions were imposed there was no war. Then he cried, "Move the British Fleet in the Mediterranean and its means war". The Fleet was moved, but there was no war. Next "Oil sanctions mean war". And the British Government believed him—and all the time de Bono was complaining he had only two months' supply. The Dictators are out-thinking and out-bluffing the—no, not the democracies, but the leaders of the democracies—every time; they evidently understand our psychology if we do not understand theirs. Ciano said, "The English won't do a thing"; Ribbentrop said, "The English won't fight". And they were right. It would not have been necessary to fight had Britain been firm in the imposition of sanctions and in regard to Czechoslovakia. Dr. Goebbels now boasts that by the threat of war Germany avoided war, but secured the gains of war.

* * *

In Britain the main trouble is that no satisfactory alternative government is as yet evident. We have no hope in Mr. Chamberlain's policy or in the four who are directing it: note how the situation has deteriorated since Munich. The Prime Minister himself knows so little about foreign politics that he re-echoed Canning without knowing it, and he appears not to have heard of Machiavelli. The Dictators follow Machiavelli in believing that to lie in the interests of the State is justified; in the light of *Mein Kampf*, and Mussolini's repeated broken promises, how can the Dictators be trusted? Sir John Simon, as Mr. Swing stressed in our last issue, bears a great responsibility for the state of the world at the present time. Sir Samuel Hoare engineered an agreement in regard to Abyssinia which the people of this country rejected in horrified shame. Lord Halifax, since the Prime Minister discharged Mr. Eden and resolved to be his own Foreign Secretary, has been content to fetch and carry.

But where are the alternatives? Could we feel any happier with Mr. Attlee, Mr. Greenwood, Dr. Dalton and Sir Stafford Cripps? With Mr. Eden, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Duff Cooper, and Lord Cranbourne? With Mr. Lloyd George, Miss Lloyd George, Major Lloyd George, and the Duchess of Atholl? The country shows no more

signs of enthusiasm for any of these groups than for the Government. For the thousandth time we cry, "Oh, for an hour of Gladstone. Oh, for a man with a passion for peace and a personality which can focus, express, and implement the views of the millions of people who hate war".

* * *

ONE of the most serious casualties of the Crisis was *The Times*, which lost altogether, not merely its head, but its reputation for fairness. On October 14th we addressed this letter to the Editor :

> I am stating the view of many of your readers in expressing profound disquiet and dissatisfaction with the attitude of *The Times* in recent weeks. It is not that we disagree with the policy *The Times* has advocated; some of us have ceased to expect to do that. It is not only that the editorial columns have shown a strange ignorance or neglect of the despatches of the paper's foreign correspondents printed on another page; that merely shows the serious extent of editorial blindness. Nor is it so much that the accounts of parliamentary debates have shown a violent bias that is unusual. It is that this bias has been extended to the reports of those debates : the summaries of speeches opposed to the Government have been unduly abbreviated, while, to take one example only—Mr. McGovern, surely for the first time since *The Times* met him, has been reported in full . . . . .

This was not printed (like many other letters sent to *The Times* during the Crisis) but the Editor expressed surprise that anyone should think there was any connexion between editorial policy and the reporting of Parliamentary debates. An editor who can go to the length of saying about the transfer of Sudeten Germany, "it can scarcely be said the transfer is made under pressure of force" will say anything !

* * *

The Times was not the only casualty. The cause of religion sustained yet another setback, in large measure we believe because the dignitaries of the Church are so remote from ordinary life. If we take the Archbishop of Canterbury, for example, it is merely because he has come to represent organized religion in the eyes of the man in the street and generally pops up to support the Government in difficult days. The Archbishop's post-Abdication speech killed "the recall to religion" : everywhere in club and coffee-room we heard it described as "kicking a man when he's down". This was probably most unfair, because there is no reason to suppose that the Archbishop did not make many private remonstrances before indulging in public censure. During the Crisis he appeared as on the side of congratulation to the Prime Minister, declaring that we had peace in answer to prayer. What the thousands who had lost home and friends and all their possessions thought of the God who thus

answered prayer can only be imagined. How the Jews and persecuted Christians in Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, all those yearning for freedom, pastors of churches and others, who had begun to see a gleam of hope, regard this episcopal conception of God we dare not think. Is it not clear that the Church must think out afresh a philosophy of prayer, and give to its members clear and definite teaching? Answers to prayer that save our own skins at the expense of others are no testimony to a God of wisdom, justice, and love: the glib talk about answers to prayer has driven thousands into atheism.

* * *

WHAT is to happen in the future when all the small nations have been thrown to the wolves? When, not yet appeased, they begin not merely to lick and sniff at but to seize in their bloody jaws some British pet lamb, what then? Is is not fairly safe to prophesy that the Government will then be ready, will declare that peace can no longer be had with honour, and that—sad as it is we should have to think so—the Archbishop will be there to lead the prayers of the people for God's blessing on a righteous war? It does not take much imagination to envisage a situation of this kind, for many Christians have declared in one breath that we must thank God for the gift of peace and in the next that we did not fight because we were not ready to do so; just as many who had never lifted a finger to rectify the injustices of Versailles suddenly discovered we must allow Germany to take Sudetenland, but went on to say that of course we could not return her Colonies.

Yet who will dare to prophesy? Prof. Arthur E. Holt, one of the most distinguished of American Congregationalists, wrote an article for *Advance* recently in which he said "Hurricanes are no longer the devastating things they were . . . [They are] largely just a wind and a loud noise". Before the article appeared New England suffered one of the most destructive hurricanes in its experience. Not only, by impish irony, was the house of the Editor of *Advance* damaged, but Congregational Churches in Connecticut suffered to the extent of £40,000 and in Massachusetts of £30,000. Prophecy about the future of international affairs may rebound on the prophet even as speedily.

* * *

CRISIS observations:

1. The South of England was much more pro-Chamberlain than the North; we had no opportunity of judging in Scotland and Wales. There was a substantial majority of women for Chamberlain, and most of the men over 60; men between 40 to 60 seemed largely against him.
2. Even cultured men rationalize easily. Many who had been strongly pro-Czech became pro-Chamberlain when war

threatened. The welfare of their sons was the real reason for the change, but they produced other arguments to justify it. For this, of course, they are not to be criticized, especially by those who had no sons; they also were rationalizing on other lines.

3. The constant stream of young pacifists seeking counsel, of devoted workers for the League in a quandary, could not but arouse intense sympathy. And, of course, the ultimate decision had to be with themselves. Even now they are anxiously asking how their witness can best be borne. And what guidance has the Church to give them?

Of course, the only logical positions are those of the absolute pacifist and of the believer in the material force. If the pacifist is prepared to let the dictators overrun Britain and India, and seize the Colonies and mandated territories, believing that resistance and war would settle nothing, but bring worse evils on the world, he is entirely consistent.

On the other hand, many peace-lovers, and even some pacifists, have discovered that, in the ultimate, there is something they love even more than peace—freedom, the sacredness of the individual personality, describe it as you will. They have asked themselves whether a peace which inflicts intolerable brutalities on inoffensive people can be right, which destroys, not for themselves but for others, not only life but those elementary rights without which life is not worth living.

Here are some other comments—first from American Congregationalists, second from the English wife of a German Socialist, the author of *I Married a German*.

Whether Chamberlain is the great peace-maker or the great betrayer—let history decide. What other actors played hidden parts, and why they played—we must wait to understand. But on the face of it, we can only see the things which are readily apparent. Czechoslovakia deserted and dismembered, despite the treaty obligations of France. Germany victorious—every "concession" granted at Munich later repudiated. France humiliated, fearful before her inner confusions. Britain insulted, bullied as never before in her history. Russia ignored. The Balkans open to Hitler's new advance. Italy, acquiescent, but ready to demand its share of plunder. We are troubled by the haunting suspicion that Mr. Chamberlain sold out Czechoslovakia because he preferred to have Nazi Germany rather than Communist Russia dominate central Europe. If this be the true reading of Mr. Chamberlain's motives, might we not well question the profundity of his democratic fervour? And, will any nations anywhere unite to achieve anything save their own selfish ends? We may argue until doomsday that they should thus unite—but it is wishful thinking, pure and simple. Nations work and fight for what will serve their interest—just as Britain

and France did in this year 1938. There is no use in our fooling ourselves. There is abundant evidence that individuals can be altruistic. There is—as yet—no evidence that a nation can draw one sustained disinterested breath . . . .

There is considerable warrant for the conviction that Hitler would have backed down, if Great Britain and France had shown a plain and unmistakable readiness for alliance with Russia to protect Czechoslovakia. One has an uncomfortable feeling that it is Toryism that has conquered, and that democracy has been defeated in its homelands as well as abroad. Certainly the meeting of representatives of the four powers to settle things according to their own will, without Russia or Czechoslovakia represented, was, in fact and in spirit far removed from the international conference which President Roosevelt had in mind. The action of Great Britain and France in this matter would seem to indicate a complete disregard of all that was intended in the League of Nations, both in spirit and in practice. There is, of course, the possible assumption that Hitler's modifications of his demands and his statement that he will not seek further territorial aggression in Europe are to be taken seriously. In the light of past events and in the light of his own program, as bluntly stated in *Mein Kampf,* there would not seem to be much warrant for that assumption.

The English wife of a German, speaking of English visitors in Germany:

"Of course they think you are idiots", I reflected ruefully, though I did not say so aloud, for they were an exceptionally nice and wide-awake group. "They see how every time Hitler makes a peace speech it is accepted in England on its face value and how everything he does is excused on the plea that he is protecting Europe from Communism, despite the fact that all its worst features are now apparent in Germany under another and more hypocritical guise. They marvel that you are so blind to your own strength and their fundamental weakness that you dare not call Hitler's bluff for fear of war. They know that, having so much more reason to fear war than you have, they would time and again have had to climb down had you taken a firm line, just as the individual German official gives way to persistent pressure. Inwardly, they are surprised themselves at the ease with which they have reduced Europe to panic by alternating threats with promises, the one little more likely to be carried out than the other. Their re-armament is real enough and menacing enough, but chiefly because it has so vastly increased their self-confidence and lessened that of others. As an actual weapon, they prefer the twisting treachery practised by all the characters in their pagan *Niebelungenlied,* whose spirit they have re-invoked. Naturally they think that people who allow themselves to be confused by it are idiots".

* * *

To conclude. Readers of these pages, we know, have strong and varied opinions, from those who find the Conservative *Yorkshire Post's* apologia (Dec. 8th) a convincing indictment of the Government to the absolute pacifist or to the non-pacifist to whom the supreme factor is that Mr. Chamberlain averted war. Cannot all agree on these four points?

(1) The Prime Minister did well in securing personal contact with the German Chancellor and in evoking the peaceful sentiments of masses of the German people.

(2) Full use must be made of the radio and all other means in the effort to "get across" the British attitude to Germans, Italians, Arabs, Japanese.

(3) A positive peace policy must be discovered and expounded, in which justice for every nation and freedom for all peoples shall be secured.

(4) There must be individual sacrifice to the uttermost, especially for the refugees.

* * *

Is not one of the functions of Congregationalism to show that there is no real antithesis between evangelical and modernist, Catholic and Protestant? Many readers of this journal, we are confident, would gladly adopt all four designations. And at the same time cannot we reconcile the Barthian conception of God, with its emphasis on the transcendent, the wholly-other, and the mystic's emphasis on God's immanence? "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart" enshrines a truth often overlooked, in which the needed reconciliation may be found.

* * *

THE fact that emerged most clearly from the World Conference of Faith and Order at Edinburgh was the need for further consideration on the nature of the Church. Two important contributions to the study of the subject have been recently made, one by an Anglican, Dr. H. L. Goudge, the other by a Methodist, Dr. R. Newton Flew. The tone of the Preface to Dr. Goudge's *The Church of England and Reunion* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.) warmed our hearts. Dr. Goudge is convinced that the reunion of Christendom is absolutely necessary if the work of God is to be rightly done, that the Church of England, the Bridge Church, is not making the great contribution to reunion it ought to make, and that the rigorous discussion of differences is essential to progress. Unhappily the temper with which the book starts is not maintained; already on p. 4 we have the categorical statement that the ministry of the Church of England "goes back in an unbroken line to the apostles themselves", and by the time p. 180 is reached almost every sentence arouses protest and challenge, and Dr. Goudge is revealed as rigid, dogmatic, and unyielding. Dr.

Goudge's pleasant style and his promise of thorough treatment at first conceals the fact that he starts out with a priori conceptions into which all the evidence is made to fit: he quotes the Synoptics or the Fourth Gospel, *Ephesians* or the Pastorals arbitrarily, and selects texts in the same way ("it is difficult to exaggerate the importance which St. Paul attaches to Baptism", we are told, but there is no mention of "I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius"). The Reformers "confused the regular with the prophetic ministry". The Gospel of Jesus is the Gospel of the Kingdom and only

> incidentally a Gospel of individual forgiveness . . . Always the Christ is to be the Saviour of the Church, and of the individual by his faithful membership. Apart from the Church the title has no meaning, and those who have no belief in the Church should not employ it.

In defending the "Virginal Conception" of Jesus Dr. Goudge is even led to declare that to say Jesus had not an earthly father is "at once grasped" by children! But this is not the worst. "The parochial life of England before the sixteenth century was a wonderful thing" (no evidence); "our divisions have laid it in ruins. . . . Educated Nonconformists have generally little conception of the curse which Nonconformity in its lowest forms can be in a country village, or of the methods to which it will sometimes stoop" (not a word about ecclesiastical oppression and snobbery and persecution of Nonconformists). "The Nonconformist communions have done scarcely anything themselves" for religious education. Of Congregationalism Dr. Goudge shows he knows nothing (cannot someone lend him Dale?) and his patronage of Nonconformity is in striking contrast to his attitude to Rome. It is melancholy indeed that a journey which starts out with such promise should so soon enter the dark defiles of intransigeance and end in the morasses which have engulfed so many.

At Edinburgh Dr. Flew played an active part, and his *Jesus and His Church* (Epworth Press, 6s.) is a distinct service to Christian scholarship. Dr. Flew possesses not only learning but a lucidity which the learned often lack, while his method of pausing to sum up an argument is most helpful. The volume is the Fernley-Hartley Lecture, and there are homiletic echoes in it (the epithets in "excellent remarks" and "a most valuable and influential book" suggest the pulpit rather than the study), but it is a competent and timely investigation of the Church as seen in the New Testament. Dr. Flew is not always convincing; he seems, *e.g.* (p. 186) to reject Sohm's view too easily: there appears to be a conflict between statements on p. 203 ("Paul traced his credentials not to the mandate of a local community, but to his commission from the Risen Lord"—the personal, direct, individual call of Paul is elsewhere emphasized)

and that on p. 205 ("The call from God was never merely individual, solitary, inward, but within a community which is indwelt by the Spirit"). We wish too, that the conception of the local community as a microcosm of the whole Church (p. 19) had been developed. Like Dr. Goudge, Dr. Flew emphasizes the Old Testament, and shows that the roots of the conception of *Ecclesia* lie deep in the religion of Israel. In the New Testament he finds an "extraordinarily impressive" unanimity about the nature of the Church. It is God's own creation, called into being by the Word, on which the principle of authority in the Church is based. The book ends with an eloquent plea for Christian union, and we hope it will have the wide and careful reading it deserves.

* * *

THE ordinary Christian—Roman Catholic almost as much as Protestant—has so fallen a prey to the *Laborare est orare* conception that little time is given to prayer and meditation; a brief five minutes, a short "quiet time", is thought to be an achievement. Here is some advice from a mother to her son:

> I will tell you what rule I observed . . . when I was young and too much addicted to childish diversions, which was this: never to spend more time in any matter of mere recreation in one day than I spent in private religious duties.

The same woman writes:

> I have often wished they would talk less of themselves and more of God. I often hear loud complaints of sin, *etc.*, but rarely, very rarely any word of praise and thanksgiving to our dear Lord.

No, reader, you are wrong: the references are not to the Group Movement. It is merely Susanna Wesley speaking of some of the early Methodists; she also deplored that her sons should deny themselves the name of Christian before their conversion:

> I think you have fallen into an odd way of thinking . . . I cannot think that you were totally without faith before.

These and other remarkable sayings of the mother of Methodism may be seen in a readable sketch by Miss M. R. Brailsford (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.).

* * *

ALL Directors of the London Missionary Society, and especially those called to take action on the Rev. Norman Goodall's recommendations following his visit to India, should be set to read Bishop J. W. Pickett's *Christ's Way to India's Heart* (R.T.S., 2s.) and be made to get 75 per cent in an examination thereon. As preliminary reading they should master Dr. C. N. Moody's *The Childhood of the Church*, reviewed within. Bishop Pickett has already written authoritatively on *Christian Mass Movements in India*: here he

reveals the opportunity, points out the mistakes, and analyses the problem of the Church in India to-day. Like Dr. Moody, he shows that often the missionary has failed to preach Christ, but he shows too that Christ can be lifted up so that He attracts not only the individual but the community, not only the depressed classes but the higher castes, not only the Hindu but the Moslem. Coming as they do from one who knows the work so intimately, his recommendations go to the root of the matter and should have the most careful consideration. The Bishop of Dornakal, who writes a Foreword, is one of India's leading exponents of Church Union and the South India Scheme: we hope it is by accident and not by design that he never uses the title "Bishop" in referring to Dr. Pickett, who is a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

May we say we hope, too, that steps are being taken to secure a wider circulation for Mr. Goodall's circular letters during his tour? They are excellent reading and most effective missionary propaganda.

* * *

So much disapproval and even disgust was felt at the attitude of the Papacy to Mussolini's rape of Abyssinia that there is all the more pleasure in recording the brave and uncompromising support Roman Catholic Bishops in China have given to the Chinese people in their struggles. They have expressed both confidence in General Chiang-Kai-Shek and detestation of the policy and methods of the Japanese. *The Voice of the Church in China* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.)—a collection of episcopal documents of recent date—is heartening not only as an expression of the courage of the Bishops, but also for its recognition of Christians of other folds. Not least interesting to readers of this journal will be the Preface by Dom Pierre-Celestin Lou Tseng-Tsiang, formerly minister for Foreign Affairs in China, and now a Benedictine Monk. He says:

> I first came to know Christianity through the London Missionary Society, under the auspices of which I received baptism. I have retained grateful memories of the kindness of the missionaries of this Society, and I owe them many hours of happiness in childhood which I can never forget. I am happy to take this opportunity of recording faithfully my feelings, in no wise altered but rather otherwise, by my conversion to the Catholic Church, to which I was drawn by the consistency of its doctrine, by its hierarchical government and by the precision of its teaching and precepts.

* * *

THE Conference arranged by the recently formed Marriage Guidance Council, which has Dr. A. Herbert Gray as its President, proved an interesting function from many points of view. The Committee of the Council comprises medical, clerical, and lay elements, men and women, and the same classes are represented on the Advisory Board.

The Council has set out to remedy the "deplorable lack of suitable persons" to give much needed guidance on matrimonial problems. Its functions—(1) Educational, (2) The Provision of Public Services, (3) Research—are set out in detail in a Memorandum which can be obtained from the Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Hume, 13 Wildwood Road, London, N.W.11. The aims are sound, but it is doubtful whether the Council is aware how far the thought and practice of many young people to-day have swept beyond the situation contemplated by the Memorandum, and it will not be easy to reach them with a statement of the Council's case for permanent monogamous marriage and against pre-marital and extra-marital sexual relations.

The speakers at the Conference were Prof. Morris Ginsberg, Dr. Lilias Blackett Jeffries, Dr. Edward Griffith, Dr. Ethel Dukes, Dr. Noel Harris, Dr. Joan Malleson, Mr. Kenneth Walker, Dr. Emanuel Miller, Dr. Burnett Rae, and Dr. Gray, and the subjects "The Social Background of Marriage"; "Preparation for Marriage"; "The Psychological Aspects of Marriage"; "Sexual Difficulties in Marriage"; "Training for Marriage: the Task of the Parent"; "Modern Sex Relationships and Marriage". There was a good deal of overlapping, but on the whole the contributions were serviceable. Especially noteworthy were the papers of the three women doctors—Dr. Blackett Jeffries, Dr. Ethel Dukes, and Dr. Joan Malleson, who in every way threw the male medical representatives (with the exception of Dr. Miller, who, like his fellow-Jew, Prof. Ginsberg, gave a masterly address) into the shade; they had prepared more carefully and presented their material more effectively. Their addresses were in themselves a convincing vindication of the place of women in the medical sphere. Some of the men were very slapdash in their presentation—a reaction, let us hope, from the meticulous care they show in other ways. We had singular subjects and plural verbs, and lovely sentences such as that about those who marry with the intention "of avoiding parenthood to commence with".

The Conference in itself showed the tremendous need of education. One rector acclaimed one of the lectures as what he "had been waiting to hear for 40 years"; and he could have obtained all the lecture contained in hosts of books written, well, if not any time during forty years, at any rate since the War. Many doctors, too, are hopelessly antiquated in regard to these subjects.

One thing emerged clearly, the need for co-operation between doctors and ministers and social workers. We heard about psychologists who destroyed religious faith, on the one hand, and about clergy who did harm by ignorant meddling in psychotherapy, on the other; between these extremes there was recognition of the way in which spiritual and mental therapy can be allied to scientific knowledge. The Church has lost its hold on most of the people of

the land; it must not fail to give adequate help to those it still retains. Ministers would do well to communicate with the Council as a first step.

* * *

THE reading of the late Sir Charles Firth's *Commentary on Macaulay's History of England* (Oxford Press, 21s.) brings back many memories, for we listened to the lectures which are the basis of the *Commentary* over a quarter of a century ago. Looking back, we are conscious that a choice made between Cambridge and Oxford to use scholarships for post-graduate work was really decisive for life. On the one side was the bias of the Professor, himself a Cambridge man, who was anxious that his student should work under his collaborator, Dr. Harold Temperley, at Peterhouse, and the fact that in its history Cambridge was more Puritan than Oxford; on the other were (*a*) Mansfield and Dr. Selbie, (*b*) The Bodleian, and (*c*) C. H. Firth. Had Cambridge been the choice, perhaps politics and documents relating to the War might have been our lot instead of Elizabethan Puritanism and Congregationalism. It is an interesting speculation. Acquaintance with Firth was an introduction to a mind of almost encyclopædic range; it was difficult to catch him out even on details of Nonconformist history which might have been thought to be outside his sphere. Often fortunate in being alone with him at Oriel in the period reserved for research students on Tuesday evenings, and almost invariably getting a lift with him in his cab—an ancient horse-drawn contraption—until the ways to Northmoor and Southmoor Roads diverged, we had ample opportunity to pick his brains and marvel at the extent of his acquaintance with books and manuscripts, pamphlets and ballads.

These lectures on Macaulay are excellent illustrations of his learning and of his method. He recognizes to the full Macaulay's achievement—his amazing power as a writer of narrative, and his industry both in collecting evidence and presenting it in an attractive manner; recognizes, too, that the phenomenal success of the *History* was due to the fact that it was happy in the moment of its appearance. We learn about Macaulay's conception of history and his use of authorities and literature, and then his chapters are examined in detail. His insularity is noted and is shown to be so marked that the chapters on continental relationships require re-writing rather than revision. His errors in regard to Claverhouse, Penn, and Marlborough clearly arose from the fact that, having reached certain conclusions in regard to their characters, Macaulay ignored or brushed aside evidence opposed to those conclusions. The *Commentary* is a pattern for all writers of history—and not for them alone.

* * *

MUCH interest was aroused by our competition "When Congregationalists Share". The characters, as supplied by "J.C.", are as follows:—

Minor Prophet	J. S. Whale
Inspired Mouse	W. B. Selbie
Blackheathian	T. Wigley
Ocili	Ilico
Sandy	A. J. Grieve
Minus Accent	A. E. Garvie
Adullam	S. Cave
Coat so Gay	A. Peel
O'Reilly	W. Riley
Glowing Orb	J. E. James
Constant Reader	Any Ministerial Correspondent
Gwilyhughlinc	Any Moderator
Tom	T. T. James
Dick	W. Dick
Harry	H. Bulcock
Polly	H. C. Carter
From the Peace Front ...	C. J. Cadoux

The character which caused most trouble was the "Glowing Orb", many competitors identifying him, not without reason, as Dr. J. D. Jones rather than the Rev. J. Ernest James. Several entries desired to make Mr. B. L. Manning "Sandy" rather than Dr. Grieve. Competitors who have given Moderators' names (Gwilym Rees, Hugh Jenkins, D. Lincoln Jones) for "Any Moderator" have been credited as correct. Some have endeavoured to identify the "Constant Reader"; one competitor shrewdly if rather cruelly labels him "A Stickit Minister".

The Rev. C. E. Surman, of Reading, gives what is practically a correct answer, his "Constant Reader" being "Anon". Next comes Mr. Arthur Porritt, formerly Editor of the *Christian World*. To both these, copies of *Thirty-Five to Fifty* have been sent.

It is fitting that Mr. Surman, who is giving so much labour to the preparation of the Directory of Congregational Biography (in which we trust all our readers are helping) should have won this particular competition.

One entry, which was labelled "Too easy", had half-a-dozen incorrect identifications!

Readers have suggested that this feature of the *C.Q.* should be repeated, and one or two have suggested that the next competition should be the identification of "J.C." That, however, must remain a secret of the editorial breast for the present. Suggestions for suitable competitions for our pages will be welcome. Cannot some genius send along a really good denominational cross-word—"Torquemada" standard?

* * *

Once more the R.T.S., through its various subsidiaries, sends out to the world an ample supply of books for boys, girls, and little children (*Little Dots*, 2s. 6d.), as well as for adults and students. Among the Annuals are *The Boy's Own* (10s. 6d.) and *Schoolboy's* (3s. 6d.), the *Girl's Own* (10s. 6d.) and *Schoolgirl's* (3s. 6d.), the *Woman's Magazine* and the *Sunday at Home* (12s. 6d. each). The Society is doing much to keep life sweet by its steady stream of healthy literature.

* * *

The Halley Stewart Lectures by Professor John Hilton postponed from the Autumn will be delivered in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, on February 23rd, 28th, March 2nd, 7th, and 9th at 6 p.m. Readers may care to know that the addresses of Dr. C. J. Cadoux and Mr. Bernard L. Manning at the Autumn Assembly at Bradford have been published by the Independent Press under the title of *The Reformation* (6d.).

* * *

We pass on to our ministerial readers, with good marks, the method of the minister who was told by an angry member of his congregation that he was not fit to be pastor of the church and ought to resign. He answered, "I quite agree with you, brother. But unfortunately the trouble is that you and I are in such a hopeless minority that it would be useless for us to try to bring the church to our view".

The best story heard at Bradford, or at any rate the best suited to these pages, is of a small boy crying bitterly. To his young friend who asked the reason of the tears he explained that he was crying because his dog had died. "Well, you shouldn't cry, my grandfather died last week, and I didn't cry". "Yes, but you hadn't had him since he was a pup!"

With that deserves to be put the story of the non-provided school which the vicar visited every week for religious teaching. It was his custom to hear the children say the Creed. They stood round and said a clause in turn. On one occasion there was a long pause, broken at last by the remark, "Please, sir, 'er as believes in the 'oly Ghost isn't 'ere to-day".

Canon Harold Anson was at one time domestic chaplain to Bishop Festing, of St. Albans. Invited to conduct a Quiet Day for the bishops of the province, Festing, so Canon Anson relates,

> searched in the cupboard where he kept his old sermons, and, to his astonishment, told me it was full of dry-rot. This he said in all solemnity. "However", he added, "I have found a set of addresses which I gave some years ago to the Girls' Friendly Society. On looking through these, I really find nothing which does not apply equally well to the needs of bishops. So I propose to give them these"!

DIVINE PURPOSE.[1]

By Edward Grubb, M.A.

The question whether there is a Divine Purpose working itself out in the order of this world is vital for religion. For the main difference between a religious and a non-religious person is that the former recognizes in the world a higher purpose than his own, but one which he has to make his own because he knows it to be good. "In His will is our peace". The vexed question of Divine Personality turns, I believe, on this matter of purpose. For we may define a *person* (roughly) as "a being that can frame a conscious purpose". The best authorities appear to be agreed that a wholly "immanent" (or unconscious) purpose is a contradiction in terms. It is true that we cannot, with Paley, regard the detailed appearances of design in nature as direct proofs of the existence of a personal Creator, since these can be regarded as adaptations to environment brought about through natural selection. And yet the presence in all living matter of an end in view, towards which all organs co-operate, cannot be thus set aside. If it is true that wherever there is purpose there must be Mind, or Consciousness, behind it, then this remains as the main argument for rational Theism. It does not carry us very far, for the purpose we think we discern may not always be clearly *good*; but, so far as it goes, it seems to me irrefutable. It needs supplementing by evidence derived from human history, and from man's moral experience, as well as from what is called revelation.

Meaning and Value in the World.

Mr. Aldous Huxley, in *Ends and Means,* does not admit its force. What he does is to argue powerfully—all the more so as he frankly admits a change in his own experience and outlook—for recognizing Meaning and Value in the world : as opposed to the idea, which seems to be gaining adherents, that the world as a whole is meaningless, save in so far as we, intelligent beings, create partial values for our own guidance. But nowhere, I think, does he adequately explain what the meaning of the world is, nor wherein its value consists. He tells us we may discover this by undergoing a discipline of mind and spirit, requiring much self-control, which

1 This Essay is based on a reading of three recent books : *Ends and Means,* by Mr. Aldous Huxley ; *The Purpose of God,* by Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's ; and *The Riddle of the World,* by Dr. D. S. Cairns. The two latter, though earlier in date, seem to supply much that is lacking in the first, which pleads for a recognition that the world has meaning and value. They suggest that its meaning and value depend on the presence of a purpose not wholly beyond our understanding. At the same time, Mr. Huxley suggests certain objections to personal ideas of God which do not seem to be quite adequately met by the other writers.

yields a power of mystical insight. This is all to the good, but happily, while it is no doubt true of many mystics, the facts of human religious experience do not seem to justify such a narrowing to the few of the path to worthy life. It does not appear that sound religious insight is confined to persons who have gone through a course of deliberate and systematic discipline. It comes unsought to many whose discipline has been that of striving resolutely to live in accordance with the best they know.

A more adequate philosophy would (I believe) show that meaning and value can only be rightly attributed to the world in terms of personality. "The world", wrote John Keats (whom Dr. Cairns quotes), "is not a vale of tears, it is a place of soul-making". If there is any worthy end "to which the whole creation moves", it can only be the making of manhood: the development of persons, who bear in themselves the imprint of the Highest, and are being trained for communion with Him and fellowship with one another. The inherent and inalienable worth of all human personality is the keynote of the only philosophy that can really satisfy. Any so-called philosophy that restricts inherent worth to persons of one race or colour, creed or class or nation, is essentially retrograde. The making of all manhood in the Divine image is, so far as we have the power to discern it, the Purpose of God.

Impersonal Religion.

Dr. Cairns, in *The Riddle of the World,* shows reasons for believing that an impersonal religion such as is offered us by Mr. Aldous Huxley (as also by Prof. Julian Huxley in *Religion without Revelation*) tends to depersonalize the individual man. If "God" is thought of as wholly impersonal, then personality is not the greatest and worthiest object of human endeavour. In this case, the more religious we are, the more our efforts are likely to be directed to something else than the development of manhood. In some places where Mr. Huxley writes of God as "impersonal", the term *super*-personal would seem to be more appropriate and adequate. But it is one to which we can attach no clear meaning; indeed it is self-contradictory if personality is really the *highest* object of human thought. To most of us that which is impersonal appears to be either a *thing* or else an *abstraction*. These may be universal in their scope, like the supposed ether of space or the law of Gravitation; but both would seem to be of a lower order of reality than personal beings. If this is so, the task of philosophy is not to depersonalize God, but to reach an idea of personality that shall be worth attributing to Him.

Personality and the Infinite.

At this point Mr. Huxley, while his attempted application of philosophy to life appears to me of great value, does not help us

much. He is at pains to point out with some fullness certain moral dangers that are inherent in personalizing the Divine. But every good thing has its dangers, and "the corruption of the best is often the worst". I must not attempt here to summarize his criticisms of orthodox religion. It may suffice to admit at once that any conception of personality which makes God into a limited being like ourselves (even if it be the "Invisible King" once proclaimed by Mr. H. G. Wells) is out of court. We have to find room, in our thought of Him, religious as well as philosophic, for all that science is revealing to us of the immeasurable vastness of the material universe, and for all that He has meant, when at their best, to our Wordsworths, Carlyles, and Emersons. While such terms as "infinite", "absolute", and "eternal" can only be defined by negations, they are *not meaningless*; and the vague conceptions for which they stand must be kept in the background of our minds if we are not to fall into something like idolatry. The spirit of humble adoration of a "numinous" Being that is far beyond our utmost conceiving is essential for true religion. In this sense, a measure of Agnosticism cannot be dispensed with. It is found in many of the Greek Fathers, like Chrysostom[2], in Thomas Aquinas, and in all genuine religious philosophy.

Wanted—a Synthetic Philosophy.

We seem therefore to need a synthetic philosophy that combines the personal aspect of God with that which is called the impersonal. Dr. Matthews and Dr. Cairns believe that such a philosophy underlies the Christian religion. What is its true nature? Let me try to express it in my own way. It starts with a certain dualism between the two orders of experience which are called "natural" and "spiritual". The natural order is that of *phenomena*—of the world as it appears to the senses, ordered by the intellect; the world that science observes and investigates. The other order is properly called *noumenal*; but, as this word is ugly and unfamiliar to non-philosophers, I prefer to call it simply *spiritual*, while recognizing the vagueness and ambiguity of this word. The term stands for the order of reality that lies behind phenomena and gives them their deepest significance. If we have knowledge of it, as we surely have, such knowledge is *subjective* rather than objective: it is a knowledge that depends, not directly upon the senses and intellect, but upon an *intuition* of reality akin to that by which we know our own minds and (by inference) the minds of other persons. The main difficulty about calling it "knowledge" is that it has no language of its own by which it can be expressed to ourselves or others. Rudolf Otto has brought this out in *The Idea of the Holy*. The results of intuition

[2] See passages quoted by Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, 183-190, and by A. C. McGiffert in *The God of the Early Christians*, 137-143.

can only be suggested in *figures* drawn from our experience of the phenomenal order. "Spirit" itself means *breath*.

Christianity tells us that the knowledge of God depends on the use of "faith". This means in essence that it is subjective and intuitive, not observational and demonstrable. But so is our knowledge of ourselves and other minds—as Dr. W. E. Hocking showed in *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*. Philosophy itself seems to require a supreme and universal *Subject*, to whom phenomena "appear", for whom and in whom they possess a relative reality. If it is religious philosophy it calls that supreme Subject "God". It must be personal, in that it is a Consciousness akin to our own. But it is not a finite consciousness, limited like our own in time and content. That is where popular and non-philosophic religion is apt to go astray, creating a God in the image of men. As I have said, it is vital, even to true religion, that God should be thought of as infinite, absolute, and eternal, even though to such terms we fail to attach clear meaning. He is not a superior phenomenon.

But how can such a Being be said to manifest a *purpose*? Purpose always looks to the future; but for God, since He is eternal, there is no before and after. It seems that His "personality", and with it His "purpose", is just the highest of those figures of speech with which alone we can express the Reality that lies behind phenomena. But the experience of humanity, taken at its best, seems to show that these are *true* figures which we cannot dispense with. Our experience of purpose suggests an element in the Divine Mind which is not less real for being by us inconceivable.

Revelation.

To thoughtful believers like Dr. Matthews and Dr. Cairns Christianity is no fancy religion of human devising, but contains a revelation, or true adumbration, of the hidden Reality that lies behind the phenomenal world. In what valid sense can we use this word "revelation"? Not in the sense of a placarding of absolute truth in infallible language for all to read. There are no infallible words, and absolute truth is beyond human apprehension. In the New Testament the term "revelation" is used for the unveiling, in the personal experience of individuals, of truth that had before been hidden. It is individual Christians, one by one, who learn in their own hearts what God reveals to them (*Matt.* $11^{25\text{-}27}$, 16^{17}, *Gal.* $1^{15,\ 16}$). God has always been in some measure revealing Himself to men (*Acts* $17^{26\text{-}28}$); but He did so in a special way to the Hebrew prophets, one after another, and most of all, to those who respond to the revelation, in His Son Jesus Christ (*Heb.* 1^{1}). Christian "faith" is this response. Christ was known at first as a person in human history;

but reflection on what He was and did soon gave Him cosmic significance. He was identified by Jewish Christians with the "Wisdom" of God, His agent (so some of their sages had taught) in creating and moulding the world (*Prov.* $8^{22\text{-}31}$). To Paul he was the "image" of God (*2 Cor.* 4^{4}). Finally, by the fourth Evangelist he was identified with the "Logos" (or Divine Reason) which had always been the Light of men (*John* $1^{1\text{-}4}$).

There seems to be here at least the beginning of the synthesis we are seeking between thoughts of God as "impersonal" and as personal. "No man hath seen God at any time" (in Himself He remains the Divine Dark); but "the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he *interpreted* Him" (*John* 1^{18}). In Christ we have a valid adumbration, in facts of experience, of the unseen Reality. "God, who said Light shall shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (*2 Cor.* 4^{6}).

Such was "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ": a *living* God, who did not simply wait passively for men to find Him, as they may in measure discover the processes of nature. He was a God who took the initiative in revealing Himself to men and preparing them to receive the revelation. This initiative is suggested by the Christian term "the *grace* of God". "Grace" is the active love of God working in the souls of men, not as a force works mechanically in a steam-engine, but enlightening their minds, kindling their affections, and energizing their wills to receive and respond to Him.

There is more. The revelation in Christ brought new thoughts not only concerning God but concerning the real nature of man himself. In Christ God had taken our human nature upon Himself, and had shown its true worth and possibilities. Christ was not only the "image" of God, He was also the "image" of man as God intended man to be (*2 Cor.* 3^{18}). Hence an intelligent belief in the Incarnation brought a great reinforcement of that sense of the worth of manhood as such, which had been dimly discerned by some of the Stoic philosophers, and had been taught in life and action, if not in set terms, by Jesus in the flesh. It is this perception of the inherent worth of manhood, as we have seen, that gives content to the belief that the world has meaning and purpose.

The Self-Limitation of God.

Belief in the Incarnation is thus vital for Christianity, however serious may be the philosophic difficulty that it involves. How the unseen transcendent Reality, infinite and eternal, that lies behind the phenomenal world could take upon itself the limitations of humanity, and enter the stream of time, we may not understand. But, if it is true, it deepens indefinitely our appreciation of the revelation we have

been considering. For it means that the very nature of God is self-sacrificing love. The early Christians saw truly that it meant the self-sacrifice of God (*Phil.* 2^{5-8}). In modern terms, if the Infinite is to become real to us, it can only be that God limits Himself that we may know Him. Such self-limitation was discerned, not alone in the person of Jesus, but in the whole process of creation and gradual revelation (*John* 1^{3-5}); but it reached its highest point in the humiliation of the Cross. The Cross of Christ remains for Christian thought the ultimate and adequate manifestation of the love and grace of God.

This does not mean, as Celsus wrongly imagined, that the early Christians supposed that revelation commenced at Bethlehem: that God suddenly awaked and began to do what He had not done before. Through the Logos, as Origen explained, He had "always been doing good to the human race. For no noble deed has ever been done among men without the Divine Logos visiting their souls". Nor does it mean that God always reveals Himself in acts that are miraculous and indubitable. *Luke* reports Jesus as saying that "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall men say, Lo here! or there!" (17^{20-21}). The strongest of the negative arguments about the good purpose of God is that it is so rarely apparent; but the difficulty is no new one. It is a frequent theme of the psalmists of Israel (note especially *Ps.* 44); and the orthodox belief expressed in *Ps.* 37 that it can always be discerned in God's treatment of the righteous and the wicked was fiercely contradicted by Job. Our Lord Himself, in the garden and on the Cross, appears to have longed for a sign that His Father had not forsaken Him. The love of God is a "hidden" love, but manifests itself, even amid sore perplexity, to those whose eyes are opened to receive it. To such it is given to discern a purpose of love working even in the processes of nature, and using as an instrument even human sin and blindness. Of this the Cross, again, has been seen as the supreme manifestation.

Personal Guidance.

In Christian experience the purpose of God has been discovered not only in the large movements of history but in the details of personal life. This aspect is hardly touched on in Dr. Matthews's masterly treatise on *The Purpose of God*, and the omission seems regrettable. The experience is not confined to Christianity. Socrates certainly knew something of it, and men like Tagore and Gandhi live by it to-day. In the Hebrew prophets it holds the paramount place. They all acted on the assurance that God had revealed to them individually His purpose *for them*, and that they were called by Him to make known in particular ways His larger purpose for the nation and the world at large. The sense of living under the direct guidance of His Father is a main feature of the life and work of Jesus

as a man among men. In *Acts* the guidance of the Spirit, now regarded as the Living Spirit of Christ Himself, is fundamental (8^{26-29}, 9^{10-19}, 10, 13^{1-3}, 16^{6-10}, *etc.*), The difference between the former prophets and the apostles in this matter is that, whereas in older days this personal apprehension of God's guidance had been mainly confined to a few distinguished persons, it is now granted to all faithful disciples of Jesus (*Acts* 2^{14-18}, quoting *Joel* $2^{28, 29}$—with which we may compare *Jer.* 31^{31-34}).

Such personal guidance has been known and followed by true Christians in every age. Candidates for the ministry in the Churches generally are (I believe) expected to have experienced something of a Divine call to take up this particular work. In some Churches, especially Protestant, business life also is regarded as a "calling". By the Society of Friends especially, Divine Guidance has been sought and experienced as the indispensable condition of living the Christian life, and it has been made the foundation of their whole church polity. Sometimes it has been expected, and experienced, through "monitions" of a supernormal kind; but to most modern Quakers it comes, along the common paths of life, to those whose inward eyes are illumined by the Spirit, and whose judgment is enlightened to give due weight to the facts that ought to control their decisions. If it is sought especially for the work of ministry, this is not regarded as the calling of a separated class: and it is not expected that ministerial guidance will be experienced unless the whole of life is being brought under the rule of God.

The present writer, whose mystical endowment is of the slightest, is not prepared to offer any "explanation" of personal guidance in terms of philosophy—any more than he is able to rationalize the personal touch that is involved in Revelation, or the mystery of the Incarnation. But he holds to it as a fact of experience—partly his own, but still more of others wiser and more devoted than himself—which in storms of doubt and perplexity has often acted like a sheet-anchor to the drifting vessel. If it is sought and experienced and faithfully followed, it enhances the value of human personality, facilitates the attribution of personal qualities to God, and greatly strengthens the conviction of a Divine Purpose in the world.

FAITH'S VICTORY OVER DEATH.[1]

By Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D.

Decay and dissolution wait upon every created existence, but it is man's tragic prerogative that he alone knows this and feels its deepest pangs. While all things have an end, "it is appointed unto man to die". His fellow-creatures, the may-fly and the sparrow, live in a sunlight undimmed by shadows of the swift-descending dark. But man through fear of death is all his life subject to bondage, and upon his bravest noonday a chill twilight encroaches. A being created in God's image, yet doomed to death; a creature born for eternal fellowship with the Holy, yet burdened with guilt; who "thinks he was not made to die", yet is powerless to avert the mortal stroke—apart from the Gospel there is no annulment of this standing contradiction within man's life, no resolution of this harsh discord. But the discord is there for each of us to hear—sounding faintly or clearly according to the depth of intensity of his experience. The profoundest secular thinker of our time, Martin Heidegger, has learned from Kierkegaard to see our human existence as nothing else than a *being—destined—to—die*; and although even Heidegger's philosophy cannot plumb the lowest depths of our human despair—only faith can do that—it is an infinitely more serious attempt to understand our human situation than the optimistic idealisms of an earlier day. It brings no answer to our questionings, but it is an impressive demonstration that these questionings are integral to our very existence as men; that the fear of death is not an occasional ghostly visitant of our mind's habitation, but an abiding presence overshadowing our days.

Many will deny that our humanity is or need be dominated by the fear of dying. Scientific reflection, we are told, will show us that the fear of death is irrational. Death is nothing more than a natural event—the inevitable end of organic existence. It is universal in its dominion, and man cannot hope to escape it. To be afraid of pain is reasonable enough; for pain is something unpleasant we have experienced. But it does not seem that actual dying is normally a painful process, and when that process is complete we have ceased to feel anything. No, man fears death, not because dying is really terrible, but because he lets his imagination run away with him. The fear of death is an inconvenient by-product of our human rationality. Our superiority over the animals is due to our possessing minds capable of looking "before and after". Hence, unlike the animals, we can "die a thousand deaths" in imagination. It is certainly true

1 The Drew Lecture for 1938. The Copyright is that of New College, London.

that it is only because he is a rational being that man is afraid of dying; but it is also true that this fear will be banished as his reason grows more mature. Suppose that man *is* doomed to extinction. Let him face the fact of death calmly and realize that what gives value to life is not its duration but the richness and depth of its experience. "Happiness", writes Bertrand Russell[2],

> is none the less true happiness because it must come to an end, nor do thought and love lose their value because they are not everlasting.

We note the testimony—the more impressive because unconscious—to the fundamental contradiction within our human life. Our fear of death, irrational though it be, is still the creation of our rationality. It is agreed that it is because we are *men* that we are afraid to die. But the cure prescribed is that we should became still more rational and steadfastly face the inevitable. And here also is a pointer to the truth the Gospel reveals. We can never overcome the fear of death until we face it, and the power which makes us bold to face it can deliver us from its curse. But according to the Gospel that power is no inner resource of ours. Not our reason, but only our Creator and Lord can save us from the fear of death and give us hope of immortality.

The fact of death is not really faced by the view we are considering. Let us hear Bertrand Russell again[3]:

> Belief in God still serves to humanize the world of nature, and to make men feel that physical forces are really their allies. In like manner immortality removes the terror from death. People who believe that when they die they will inherit eternal bliss may be expected to view death without horror, though, fortunately for medical men, this does not invariably happen. It does, however, soothe men's fears somewhat, even when it cannot allay them wholly. . . . *All* fear is bad and ought to be overcome, not by fairy tales, but by courage and rational reflection. I believe that when I die I shall rot, and nothing of my ego will survive. I am not young, and I love life. But I should scorn to shiver at the thought of annihilation.

Here is a man who will not consciously cheat himself with vain hopes, and who on that account deserves the respect we should refuse to the muddled thinkers who, while denying the existence of a personal God and pouring contempt on the hope of personal immortality, try to persuade us that nothing is lost and that we may still believe in "the immortality of values". If God be taken from us, and with Him all hope of a life beyond the veil, we will not bow down to the idol of a high-sounding phrase. It cannot be urged too strongly that unless *persons* are immortal there is no immortality. Bertrand Russell is

2 *What I Believe*, 21.
3 *Ibid.* 20*f.*,

at least consistent. Unquestionably he means to face death without humbug or illusion. But does he succeed?

If we could only find courage to face death in its stark reality we should be delivered from its power. But how can this be? In what way can death be an object of our experience here and now? To think of death is not to die. When we say "all men must die" we are not facing the fact of our own death, even though that is logically included in our assertion. We are still at the ordinary daylight level of awareness, where the scientist "explains" death as the dissolution of the organism, or a poet-philosopher like Goethe bids us admire it as "Nature's dodge to secure abundant life". The passing of a dear one takes us deeper. Death is a malicious demon who cheats our hope and mocks our love. But watchers by a death-bed know that dying is the one absolutely solitary human experience, and no one comes back to tell us what it means. I cannot face death until I am constrained to say "*I* must die", and this I cannot say until death ceases to be a vague future event, a "Not-Yet", and confronts me as a "Here and Now".

But of course, we shall be told, no one can know what death means until he dies. Is not this virtually what Russell is saying? The fact that we cannot know what death is until we die makes it rational for us to think as little as possible about it, to refrain from empty speculation concerning what follows it, and above all from cowardly fear. The rational thing to do is to concentrate upon the full use and enjoyment of life and the service of humanity. The moral challenge to alleviate pain and redress injustice, so far from losing its force, becomes more imperative than ever if this is the only life our distressed brethren have to live. And as for the higher delights of our human existence, is it not in our experience of these that death is finally reduced to its proper insignificance? The music-lover's enjoyment of Beethoven or Brahms is not disturbed by the reflection that within an hour the concert will be over, nor does it depend upon his reminding himself that he will have future opportunities of listening to symphonies. Like a reasonable being he gives himself up to the music and then and there experiences "eternal life" in the only intelligible meaning of the term. Most normal people think but seldom of death and the Beyond; they are too pre-occupied with the manifold concerns of living. Even religious believers, who profess a faith in immortality, think of the future life as little as their neighbours. In our modern days religion itself has become an affair of this life, the service of high ideals and humanitarian causes, and the hope of immortality plays an ever decreasing part in it. We reject Plato's view of the rational life as "a meditation upon death". For us Spinoza speaks the true word when he declares that "the free man thinks of nothing less than of death; his wisdom is a meditation not upon death but upon life".

There is both truth and error in this view. The truth in it lies in this—that the overcoming of death and the fear it inspires is most certainly the condition of a truly rational life. If we could only be reconciled to death we might be able to rise to the height of our powers of enjoyment and usefulness. But the error is serious enough to disqualify this view as a working philosophy for man as we know him. We can be reconciled to death only by being reconciled to God. It is not by mobilizing his rational resources that man can conquer the fear of death, nor can he break its spell by refusing to think about it. The issue here is a question of fact. Is it true that death dominates our human existence even when we do not think about it? We shall try to show that it is, but that the fear of death cannot be understood, much less overcome, except in the light of the Christian gospel and by faith's surrender to the Word.

What, then, is the fear of death? It is not a simple psychological phenomenon like our shrinking from pain or dread of financial ruin. These are daylight fears; what we are afraid of is a specific *something*, a definite possibility which, however terrifying, belongs to the world we understand and in which we are at home. That same world has resources we may use to avert the threatened danger. And at the worst we can steel ourselves to endure what cannot be cured and thank whatever gods there be for our unconquerable souls. But to be afraid of death is to fear—we know not what. It is not *Furcht* but *Angst*—"an agonizing premonition" of—nothingness. It is fear of that which is formless, impalpable, and non-existent—yet overwhelming in its nearness and hostility. "The menace", writes Heidegger[4],

> cannot approach us from a definite direction in our neighbourhood, it is already "there"—yet nowhere. It is so near to us that it presses upon us and takes our breath away—and yet it is nowhere.

The world in which we are so much at home becomes strange and unreal, and the fabric of our solid everyday certainties a bridge of gossamer flung across a bottomless abyss.

"But surely", says someone, "this all-consuming fear of nothingness is a very rare experience? How can it dominate our lives? Trust and confidence rather than anxiety and despair are the marks of human existence, which is possible only because we are normally preoccupied not with dying but with living". Certainly the experience is rare—but why? Because the fact of death is the great human repression, the universal "complex". Dying is the reality man dare not face. He summons all his resources to escape from it. He tries to persuade himself that the everyday world of his wishes and purposes is the real world—and for the most part he succeeds. Within that world the reality of death is represented only by the

[4] *Sein und Zeit*, 186.

general proposition that all men are mortal and by scientific statements about the dissolution of organisms. Death is muffled up in illusions. And so, be it noted, is conscience. Duty becomes that which ought to be done—by someone else. But sometimes the defences are broken down. "Just when we're safest there's a sunset touch". Death ceases to be a harmless idea or a vague object on the distant horizon and stalks towards me as my personal antagonist, and the comforting make-believe of my conventional morality is shattered by a strident "Thou art the man!" The rarity of this event as a specific experience only proves that we know how to run away from death. But one day death will overtake us, and meanwhile it is wisdom for us to know that to turn deaf ears to its challenge is not to escape its thrall. And whether we refuse to think about death or contemplate it as a future event it would be irrational to dwell upon, whether we affirm that death ends all or comfort ourselves with the thought that physical dissolution cannot reach as far as the immortal soul, whether we give ourselves up to self-indulgence or to humanitarian crusades—whatever we do or say or think we bear reluctant witness to our end. We do not think truly of death when we regard it as the negation of our present being—as the event that cuts short a life which so far as its content goes might claim to be worthy of everlastingness. Death does not merely sever the cord of life; it is interwoven into its texture. It is not "the abhorred shears", but a pallid strand among the gold. An inkling of this truth enters consciousness in the thought of death's uncertainty. We know *that* but not *when* it will come to us. This uncertain certainty intrudes into our experience less as a specific thought or fear than as a subconscious disposition underlying all our activity and changing moods. To try to escape from it is like trying to escape from one's shadow. We do not leave it behind when we enter the realms of philosophical thought. Even as "spectators of all time and all existence" our contemplation is still that of men doomed to die. For death which *must* be and at any moment *may* be, determines our entire existence not as a "Not-Yet" but a "Now". In our æsthetic experience, which some would have us believe is the surest antidote against the fear of death, its power is clearly shown. Its urgency pulses through all artistic creation. We hear it in the old tag, *ars longa, vita brevis est.* Keats knew it:

> When I have fears that I may cease to be
> Before my pen has gleam'd my teeming brain . . .
> . . . then on the shore
> Of the wide world I stand alone, and think,
> Till Love and Fame to nothingness do sink.

And in his "Ode to a Grecian Urn" the oft-quoted conclusion—

> Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty—
> That is all ye know on earth, and all ye need to know—

obscures rather than reveals the central experience of the poem, which is surely to be found in the third stanza—

> Ah, happy, happy boughs! that cannot shed
> Your leaves, nor ever bid the Spring adieu;
> And, happy melodist, unwearied,
> For ever piping songs for ever new;
> More happy love! More happy, happy love!
> For ever warm and still to be enjoyed,
> For ever panting and for ever young;
> All breathing human passion far above,
> That leaves a heart high sorrowful and cloyed,
> A burning forehead, and a parching tongue.

Beauty may be truth, but the word it speaks is that we must die; that not even in our highest raptures is our bliss the untroubled beatitude of the immortal ones. Our æsthetic experience, like the passion of artistic creativeness, bears the stigmata of mortality. What beauty may be for God we do not know, but to our ears her deathless strains come with a dying fall. So while it may be true, as Russell says, that the happiness of mortal men is still happiness, it has a poignancy which no philosophy can think away.

What weighs upon us is something heavier than the sense of our limitations as finite beings. The young man whose ambition is chastened by the dawning realization that the power he thought was genius is after all only respectable talent has not yet tasted life's bitterest draught. This is reserved for the middle years when in the steady retreat of the tide of vitality and the gradual failure of his physical and mental capacities man reads the writing on the wall. This is "the dangerous age"—the era of half-conscious but passionate revolt against the inevitableness of growing old. Far more tragic than the wild oats of hot youth is the fevered sensuality of the elderly *roué*. Man knows and yet wills not to know that Time lays him waste. If only we could grow old gracefully! But this is what as unregenerate men we cannot do. For we cannot reconcile ourselves to death. It is only by grace that old age can be graceful.

It is no mere animal instinct of self-preservation, nor an infantile egoism that inspires man's revolt against death. That he cannot persuade himself that his death is purely natural and normal is due not to an imperfect rationality, but to a dim apprehension of his divine destiny. We do not grasp the full significance of death until we see it as the frustration of man's true end—communion with God. And, as we shall see, every attempt to convince us of our immortality which does not face the fact that our empirical existence as destined to death flatly contradicts our hope of fuller life, is as truly an evasion of the issue as the blatant materialism that denies the spiritual significance of man or the sensualistic philosophy that bids him eat, drink, and be merry, since to-morrow he dies.

As we might expect, it is in his religious experience that man comes nearest to understanding the deep mystery and tragedy of his existence. Russell's psychology of religion is too facile, and so is his diagnosis of the fear of death as a craven dread of annihilation. He has not weighed the significance of the amazing contradiction of rationality against itself—that this irrational fear of death is not possible except to rational beings. Is it not the case—(Russell at any rate would agree with us here)—that man would be more at ease, more the master of his fate, if "by courage and rational reflection" he could discard the "fairy tales" of religion and sublimate his vain longings for immortality in devotion to the clamant tasks of humanity in the daylight world? It is an intolerably superficial analysis of religious experience which can dismiss the belief in God as a mere projection of man's desire to be at home in an unfriendly universe. The truth is that religion, so far from underpropping man's self-confidence, may throw him into despair, so that in proportion to his assurance of God he becomes unsure of himself. Religion brings him comfort, but it also makes him afraid; it heals his wounds, but only to rack him with new doubts and terrifying possibilities. As for man's belief in an after-life, this belongs in the first instance to the circle of proto-scientific ideas and has nothing specifically religious about it. But once the God of religion has conquered the dim lands beyond the grave, belief in an after-life, so far from mitigating the dread prospect of death, intensifies its terror. Sheol is transformed into Gehenna. Epicurus, who had more insight than some of his modern disciples, saw that what man fears is not that death is annihilation, but that it is not; that the horror is not extinction but "the wrath to come"; and Epicurus believed that the only way to liberate man from this burden is to persuade him that the high gods do not concern themselves with the petty affairs of mankind.

We have made use of a psychological analogy. But the analogy halts. There is no psychotherapy that can banish the fear of death. This is no complex which being dragged into the light of consciousness loses its power to harm us. Not thus can the fear of death be overcome, but only by faith in God's Word of Life. To faith this Word comes not as the conclusion of an argument but as incredible "good news". What is the Gospel? What is the Christian Word concerning death and immortality?

For Christian faith death is in the first place the mark of man's finitude. Though man be fashioned in God's image, though he be but a little lower than the angels and endowed with powers almost godlike in their excellence and range, here at the frontier of existence there is no commingling of divine and human, no identification of God and man, no mystic absorption into the Absolute, but One who

is the Wholly Other—a God who is not man since He is from everlasting to everlasting—and on the hither side of the boundary a man who is not God, since death claims him at last. Man's life is an *existence—unto—death*; mortality is the very stuff of his being. Because he is a creature and not the Creator man must die. Even though he be born to know God and to enjoy Him forever, he cannot make himself proof against decay or evade his creaturely doom. *From* death he cannot be saved; yet God may save him *through* it—by the miracle of resurrection.

It will not do to discard the doctrine of resurrection on the plea that it is merely the Jewish husk of teaching which is fundamentally one with that of Plato and Kant. Christian faith cannot dispense with the doctrine of resurrection precisely because it does *not* mean what Plato and Kant meant by immortality. The historical antecedents of the resurrection-idea in Persia or elsewhere have no special relevance here. It is well known that no wholly consistent doctrine of the last things can be extracted from the New Testament, and we are not committed to the variable details of the picture any more than to the crude interpretation of a bodily resurrection as the reconstitution of the fleshly frame—a view expressly excluded by Paul's own teaching. But the idea of resurrection stands on a different footing. What is its significance for faith? The answer is that it takes with full seriousness the solemn reality of death.

To believe in the inherent everlastingness of a soul-substance is to evade the issue with which death confronts us. If we are naturally immortal, death is in the last analysis unreal—a mere scarecrow to frighten cowards. Our bodies will perish but we shall not die. But note the consequence that follows from an affirmation of the inherent indestructibility of the soul-substance: the *datum* of all our thought on this subject—the unity of the personality—is destroyed. Our selves as we know them are embodied personalities. We are constrained to recognize a distinction between mind and body, and we may go as far as to speak of the latter as the organ or instrument of the former. And then if we like we can go on to speculate concerning their inter-relation. Only if we do we must be on our guard. "Mind" and "Body" are names we give to distinguishable aspects of personality; to treat them as independent entities mysteriously conjoined is merely to play with abstractions. Man is not "the mechanical union of a corpse and a ghost". All the evidence we have goes to prove this. The soul is not the body's prisoner. It not only *uses* but *is* the body. And, on the other side, the body is not a mere tool but the personality itself in its outward aspect. So much is meant when we say that personality is *social*. "There was", writes Professor A. E. Taylor[5],

5 *The Christian Hope of Immortality*, 76.

> a very good reason for the Christian insistence on the "resurrection of the body". The Christian's "world to come" is not one of solitary speculation, but one where the members love one another, are united in "the bond of charity"; and such a relation between persons who are irreducibly separate—for if they were not they could not love one *another*—demands a "body" in the sense of a medium of intercommunication of thought and affection.

And in criticism of his beloved Plato he writes[6]:

> His "immortality" of the departed soul, in which the body has no share, is, after all, dangerously like a doctrine of the survival of half a personality.

Yet it is not by considerations of this kind that faith is led to affirm resurrection. It is rather that faith knows that the belittling of death is the dishonouring of the Creator. It is no accident that the theory of a natural immortality has no room for a doctrine of creation. Even Plato, according to Professor Taylor, leaves it an open question whether souls "do not, after all, . . . exist deathlessly in their own right"[7] Of course it may be *asserted* that God is the Creator of these immortal souls, but the logic of the theory is clearly seen in the atheistic philosophy of McTaggart, who, affirming the immortality of souls in their own right, quite consistently denies the existence of a Creator-God. Along this line we may reach the supreme Monad of pluralism or the divine Artificer of deism, but never the Creator and Father of the Christian Gospel.

To faith, however, the fact of death testifies not only that man is not God, but also that he is not *good*—not only that he must die but that he deserves to die. Death is more than the fate of man's finitude; it is the judgment upon his sin. No doctrine of immortality is Christian which does not take full account of the fact that man stands before God as a *sinner*. "Immortality", wrote Kierkegaard,

> is the judgment. There is not a word more to be said about immortality. . . . . Thou shalt not labour to prove by many reasons that it is more than likely thou art immortal. No, from this inconvenience God has completely exempted thee, thou art immortal, and thou shalt give account unto God how thou hast lived—O thou immortal.

We must not allow ourselves to be sidetracked by the objection that death was in the world long before the advent of *homo sapiens*. Nor are we looking in the right direction when we postulate a historical Fall as the point at which a natural phenomenon was suddenly transformed into a penalty upon sin. "By man came death"—not as the scientific fact of the dissolution of an organism, but as the religious reality of judgment on the sinner. Man is more than an organism,

6 *Ibid.*, 16.
7 *Ibid.*, 16.

and in that "more" the sting of death lies hidden. For man's death is no merely natural phenomenon but has a significance which is determined by what man *is*—by that relation to God and God's purposes which sin has distorted. As sinners we can never know death's worst terror until faith has heard the Word of grace that delivers us from its torment. Yet underlying all our conscious fears and anxieties is "a certain fearful expectation of judgment". What confronts us in death is, after all, not sheer nothingness, but the divine reality. Behind its negation is the grand positive of God's sovereign will. It strips us bare of our tawdry pretensions by revealing the Creator and Judge before whose face we ever stand. It speaks to us of His absolute claim upon us and of our guilty denial of His royal right.

The penalty of death falls upon man as moral personality. Here again the theory of a natural immortality of the soul misses the truth; for it tends to minimize the tragic gravity of sin. As the history of the theory clearly shows, sin is identified with finitude and is traced to the soul's ignorance of its highest good. But this blindness of the soul is said to be due to its imprisonment in materiality. Soul and body are sharply sundered. The soul is the divine and deathless part of us which awaits the release death brings from the fetters of time and sense. The practical results of this teaching can be studied in the history of Gnosticism, where it issues either in a lawless immorality, which pleads that nothing to which the body stoops can hurt the soul, or in an asceticism which repudiates and mortifies the body as being inherently evil. Very different is the Biblical witness, and the teaching of Jesus Himself is unequivocal. We sin in and with our bodies, but it is we, not our bodies, that sin. The worst sins are not fleshly lusts but sins of the mind and heart, spiritual transgressions. And the judgment upon sin is the casting of soul and body into hell. The reality of sin as we know it in our sense of its guilt is the touchstone to which every philosophy and theology must be brought. And the doctrine of the soul as the divine prisoner fails the test.

A modification of this theory seems at first sight to take death more seriously. Immortality, it is agreed, cannot be predicated of the soul as an intrinsic possession. We are not created immortal, but God gives us the chance of winning immortality. To live in obedience to His law of righteousness and in communion with the highest spiritual values we know is to build even here and now a self which will be strong enough to survive the shock of death. Now certainly this view takes death more seriously—too seriously indeed for our peace of mind. You tell me I have to earn immortality—that if I am sufficiently spiritual I shall survive the earthquake of my bodily dissolution? But do you imagine you are bringing me a word of comfort? How can I be sure I am worthy of immortality? How

do I know that at my last hour my sin will not rise up to confound my foolish self-confidence? Like every pelagianism this doctrine, though conceived as a word of comfort to struggling man, throws him back into despair, because it throws him back on himself and his own moral strenuousness. If we must believe we have to earn immortality we are of all men most miserable. Truly death is being taken seriously; and yet it is not—for we are being urged to assume that somewhere within us lie moral and spiritual resources which will prove more than a match for the enemy. But we cannot hear the Gospel's word of hope without knowing that no human spirituality, however fine and pure, can turn the edge of the fatal sword or take away the terror of our end. If we are to be redeemed from death it can only be by a miracle—a resurrection.

Again, the theory we have just discussed, though in one respect nearer to the New Testament teaching, is in another more remote from it than the theory of man's natural immortality. There is a germ of truth in the latter theory which faith can recognize and interpret. We do not escape the terror of death by dying. "Though I go down into Sheol, Thou art there". It is not because the soul is naturally immortal that death does not bring annihilation, but because, living or dying, man stands continually before his Creator. As Althaus says, it is not the soul but the relation in which man stands before God that is immortal. Death for the sinner means to fall into the hands of the God who is a consuming fire. Behind the first looms the second death. The fear of death is the terror of the presence of God when His face is turned away from us in wrath, the terror of Hell. No, to die is not to escape from God; there is a resurrection to judgment. What then is that Word of Promise which faith hears? What is that Gospel which gives us hope that our Father will not suffer us for any pains of death to fall from Him? We have no resources in ourselves. We know ourselves as bankrupt sinners. The Christian gospel does not tell us that we are worthy of immortality, or that we may earn it by our virtue, but that God will raise us, not to the condemnation we have so richly deserved, but to an eternal life of communion with Himself which is the gift of His free and boundless grace.

The Word faith hears is the promise of life from the dead. The Word is the good news of Jesus Christ, the Son, crucified for our sins and raised for our justification. Now, as we have said, the Word is really "good news" in the sense that it is no discovery of our reason; it is in itself sheerly miraculous, a once-for-all happening that must be told us. The Bible and the Church bear witness to it—this gives them their indispensable *rôle* and unique authority. But faith itself bears witness to it by its very nature as man's response to the Word. Faith only knows what death means because it is itself a dying. Faith

has a right to be confident of a life beyond death because it is itself the foretaste of a resurrection. Man the sinner cannot face death, cannot see it in all its horror, precisely because he is a sinner. It is the very heart of sin in him that he cannot and will not face the truth about himself. To see and acknowledge his sin would mean the death of his sinful self. This self *must* die. The sin in him is that he has churlishly refused God's gift of life. Not that he does not long for life, or desires to dethrone God. But the life for which he longs is an autonomous existence. The deep secret of his consuming anxiety is that he cannot and will not surrender himself to God, and trust His loving wisdom. And this means that though man needs the Everlasting Arms to comfort him and give him a sense of security, though he needs God's power to second his own puny efforts, he will have God only on his own terms and in his own way. But God confronts him with a demand which is wholly incompatible with man's claim to be master in his own house. Now faith—which, let us remember, is not the climax of man's strenuous rational aspiration but the gift of the God who gives the Word—faith is the recognition of this absolute claim of God and therefore at the same time is man's surrender to death, to the judgment of God upon his sinful egoistic existence. To faith, therefore, death is no longer a fate which overwhelms the human victim but a task to be accomplished to the glory of God and a gift to be received as the earnest of eternal life. Faith is in the truest sense the "rehearsal of dying". It is that life-decision wherein man realizes perfect freedom through absolute surrender, the totality-act which Heidegger desiderates but which no philosophy but only the Word can bring to pass. How is this saving faith possible to us? The justice of God's judgment can be acknowledged because by a miracle of His grace death itself holds a promise of life. The Judge reveals Himself as the Father and sin is taken away by His almighty love. To quote Althaus again—the man of faith knows not only that he *must* but that he *may* die; that God in His mercy has made death the gateway into life everlasting.

For Christian believers the entire perspective of the problem of immortality is transformed. Current criticisms of religion which see it as man's attempt to console himself and support his self-esteem in a world which seems hostile to his aspirations are sometimes truer than we are inclined to admit. As man's attempt to get God on his side religion is the very climax of human sinning. There is a religion like that, which under protean forms afflicts man and holds him back from the truth. But faith is the antithesis of all such egoistic idolatry. The believer knows that for him the prime question is not whether God is on his side but whether he is on God's side; not whether man with his values and excellencies survives the onslaught of Time and death but whether there be anywhere forgiveness of sins and a way

of reconciliation to God. It is only when first things come first that we have assurance about the rest, and not immortality but forgiveness is the first concern of the Christian gospel; that is why to Christian faith a hope is given that cannot be shaken. We cannot fall away from the everlasting arms. We know this, not because we have convinced ourselves that we are naturally immune against death, still less that we are worthy to survive, but because at the foot of the Cross we have heard the Word of redeeming love. We do not know why He has dealt so graciously with us. If our souls have infinite worth it is only because He sets this value on them, not because of any hidden nobility still undestroyed by sin. Ours is a God who loves—*sinners*.

We have no final assurance of immortality except as we are assured of the redeeming grace of God. All other attempts to grapple with the problem of death fall at last under the same condemnation. Whether with the humanists we regard the fear of death as irrational and profess to face the certainty of our final extinction with equanimity, or whether, relying upon metaphysical arguments or spiritualistic experiences, we affirm the indestructibility of the soul, we are not facing the problem as *our* problem—as the decisive crisis of our own personal existence. Whatever confidence we win is not faith but a poor counterfeit. Death is still unconquered—still the master of our sinful pride. Truly the Gospel is foolishness to the Greeks and to all who stand in their philosophical and humanist succession. To Celsus it was a manifest absurdity that God should love sinners and that God's Son should die and rise again. What communion can the divine perfection hold with guilty men? What part can the immortal Being have in finitude and death? That Death should be made to speak of Life and Judgment of Forgiveness is the paradox of the Christian redemption, not to be whittled away by well-meant accommodations. Only faith can help us here. The Christian believer has assurance of immortality because his life is a daily dying. Christ has made him bold to wrestle with Death till Death yields up his secret name of Love. "He that believeth hath eternal life". For him the bitterness of death is past and his life is hid with Christ in God. "Faithful is the saying: For if we died with him, we shall also live with him: if we endure, we shall also reign with him".

Many questions can be asked which cannot be answered this side of Jordan, and there is much that our faith is content not to know. But what we do know we may and must proclaim. For the knowledge we have is no curiously constructed map of the Land of Promise nor a set of clever deductions from some philosophy of personality, but an authentic revelation of God, an incarnate Word. We know that God loves men and women, and not abstractions called values. We know that dear ones who have passed beyond our sight are in His

loving keeping and that we shall see them again. For a Christian to have doubts concerning personal immortality is either a strange misunderstanding of the God Jesus reveals or else sheer disloyalty to His word. If God be God, then death is gain. "Without disputing, or inquiring", says old John Donne,[8]

> I know, that when Christ sayes, *That God is not the God of the dead,* he saies this to assure me, that those whom I call dead are alive. And when the Apostle tells me, *That God is not ashamed to be called the God of the dead,* he tells me that to assure me, That God's servants lose nothing by dying. . . . If the dead and we be not upon one floore, nor under one storey, yet we are under one roofe. We think not a friend lost, because he is gone into another roome, nor because he is gone into another Land; And into another world no man is gone; for that Heaven, which God created, and this world, is all one world. If I had fixt a Son in Court, or married a daughter into a plentiful fortune, I were satisfied for that son and that daughter. Shall I not be so, when the King of Heaven hath taken that son to himselfe, and married himselfe to that daughter, for ever? I spend none of my Faith, I exercise none of my Hope, in this, that I shall have my dead raised to life again.
>
> This is the faith that sustains me, when I lose by the death of others, or when I suffer through living in misery myselfe. That the dead, and we, are now all in one Church, and at the resurrection, shall all be in one Quire.

[8] Sermon XXII, preached at St. Paul's, Easter-day, 1627.

EPISCOPACY AND REUNION.

By Dr. Alfred E. Garvie.

I.

(1) The Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937, begins with a record of ten years' progress in the reunion of Christian churches, most of the same ecclesiastical type, but some also of divergent types, for instance, the Methodist Union in Great Britain and the United Church of Canada (Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational). "No union has been consummated between a Church of radically 'Catholic' and one of radically 'Evangelical' tradition" (p. 3). It would not be accurate to describe the Church of England as radically "Catholic", as the Evangelicals and Modernists probably outnumber the Anglo-Catholics; but there can be no doubt that it is the influence of the Catholic tendency, in the Church of England, which is the source of the difficulties of the South India scheme, and is imposing obstacles in the conversations between Anglicans and Nonconformists in England. All the "Catholic" Churches are episcopal in polity; but it is not that fact, but the theory of the episcopate associated with it, which is the main hindrance.

We in Great Britain often assume that the "Evangelical" Churches must necessarily be averse to episcopacy; but there is no opposition in principle. The Scandinavian Churches, which are staunchly Lutheran, have retained the episcopate; and the Reformed Church of Hungary has bishops. Mainly political motives led to the change of polity from Bishops to General Superintendents in Germany; and since 1918 several of the territorial Churches have returned to Bishops. The Methodist Church of America is episcopal in its organization. It is then no cunning device to entrap the unwary, when it is said that an acceptance of an episcopate does not necessarily involve the Catholic, or any particular, theory. The episcopate may of course be entrusted with functions, and accorded privileges, that do need for their explanation and justification a particular theory; and those who reject that theory are entitled to insist that in any proposals made that theory shall not be involved, *e.g.*, the requirement of episcopal ordination for ministers already otherwise ordained, or the refusal of intercommunion on the ground that only an episcopally ordained minister can celebrate a valid sacrament. The Reformed Churches have generally shown a preference for the Presbyteral polity, and the Separatists (Independent and Baptists) for a Congregational. What has to be remembered is that episcopacy is not necessarily Catholic, and can be Evangelical.

(2) The Anglo-Catholic theory is given in the document, issued by the Lambeth Joint Conference, *The Practice of Intercommunion and the Doctrine of the Church* (p. 8).

The mission of the Father to the Son was committed by Him to the Apostles, and in some way by them to the bishops (the historic episcopate) in the Apostolic succession. In the argument for this assertion it is to be noted that the appeal is not to the New Testament, but to second and third century writers, that there is no conclusive historical evidence claimed as to the direct action of the Apostles in appointing bishops as their successors; and nevertheless the dogmatic assertion is made that "they have that position by the will of God", and that, despite the admission that *John* 20[21] need not apply to the Apostles exclusively, they alone, and not the whole Church, had the mission entrusted to them. It is assumed that the bishops alone have the trust and task of administration in the Church committed to them, and that they may and do delegate some of their functions to presbyters (priests) and deacons. Accordingly some Anglo-Catholics maintain that the sacrament celebrated by a non-episcopally ordained minister is no sacrament, and others that there is no certainty that it is one.

(3) This extreme application of the theory has been modified in the *Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry presented on behalf of the Church of England Representatives of the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6th, 1923* (Bell, *Documents on Church Unity, 56-163*):

> It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and to administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained them, and to which authority has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church (p. 159).

This admission is later minimized by the qualification "these ministries may be in varying degrees irregular or defective" (p. 159); but the qualification does not annul the modification of the theory. The Anglican suggestion to amend this irregularity by an episcopal ordination *sub conditione* was not accepted by the Nonconformist representatives at Lambeth, and the conversations came to a pause for several years.

(4) When the *Lambeth Conference* renewed the invitation in 1930, the suggestion was made that the difficulty might be removed on the lines of the South India proposals. In the *Outline of a Reunion Scheme,* now offered for the consideration of the churches, the following "Provisions for Inauguration" are submitted (p. 34):

> The bishops of the Church of England are accepted as bishops of the United Church, provided that they assent to the basis of union and accept the constitution of the Church. In addition presbyters shall be chosen by each of the uniting churches for consecration as bishops. . . . All the other ministers of the uniting churches in the area of the union who have been ordained as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments are acknowledged as such and have the status of presbyters in the united Church, provided that they assent to the basis of union and accept the constitution of the Church. Every such presbyter of the Church is at liberty to minister and celebrate the Holy Communion in any church of the United Church, subject to the pledge given in Section XVII above.

This is the pledge (p. 33):

> The Church, therefore, pledges itself that it will not in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long established traditions of any of the churches from which it has been formed. Neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry to which they have not been accustomed, or to which they conscientiously object will be imposed on any congregation; and no arrangements in these matters will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the Church, or imperil its progress towards union with other churches.

However desirable it might be that the union should become unity as quickly as possible, yet such a provision for the period of transition seems reasonable and right. Nonconformists have often claimed that they stand for the rights of conscience; and they should show a readiness to respect those rights for others.

(5) This *Outline* has been commended by the Archbishops to the attention of the Convocations. The Church of England is no more committed to acceptance than are the Free Churches; but should the next Lambeth Conference make proposals of such comprehensiveness, the proof would be given that the Church of England as a whole did not commit itself to the Anglo-Catholic theory of the episcopate, and was not being determined by it in its approach to the Free Churches. If so, the assurance would be made doubly sure that in accepting episcopacy, combined with presbyteral and congregational elements, and thus "representative and constitutional", no Free Churchman would be committed to any theory, nor need he fear that he would be subjected to any arrangements which would apply that theory in practice. In my next section, I shall give positive reasons against the Anglo-Catholic theory; and shall indicate the grounds on which, while rejecting the theory, Free Churchmen might at least

continue to explore the possibilities of reunion although they may still be unprepared for any immediate action.

II.

(1) To this theory I am convinced that a conclusive answer can be given, in support of which some of the most eminent Anglican scholars can be cited. The Apostles did hold a position of unique authority in the Primitive Church, because of their personal relation to Jesus as companions of His earthly ministry, and witnesses of His Resurrection as Lord, and as messengers of His Gospel. As such they were reverenced and obeyed; but the New Testament offers no evidence that their personal relation could be regarded and transferred as a permanent office of authority[1], or that they appointed bishops as their successors. Only Peter and John come into prominence in *Acts*. Paul was called to be an Apostle by special divine revelation (*Gal.* $1^{15, 16}$), and he claimed an authority equal to that of the Twelve. James, the Lord's brother, was not one of the Twelve, but came to exercise the highest authority in the Church in Jerusalem. Samaria was evangelized by Philip, and Antioch by unknown disciples. Barnabas is, as well as Paul, included in the term Apostle (*Acts* 14^{14}), and a wider use of it must be recognized. The bestowal of the Spirit was not confined to the laying on of the hands of an Apostle, for even before Baptism "while Peter was still speaking the Holy Spirit fell upon all who listened to what he said" (10^{44}). At Antioch Barnabas and Saul were set apart by the laying on of the hands of prophets and teachers ($13^{2, 3}$). The ordination of Timothy was not exclusively Paul's act, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (*1 Tim.* 4^{14}). The similar statement in *2 Tim.* 1^{6} limits the symbolic acts to Paul himself; if in one case the proposition *with* (μετὰ) is used, and in the other *through* (διὰ), it is only on the assumption that Paul himself held this theory that the difference can be regarded as significant. The first link in the chain of this theory is broken.

(2) So also is the second. Lightfoot's statement[2] regarding the equivalence of the titles "bishop" and "elder" (presbyter) is generally accepted by scholars[3]. Dean Robinson endorses Lightfoot's statement[4] that "the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation". In regard to the subsequent development a Free Church view may be quoted from the document already referred to (p. 7):

> (*a*) Persecution, schism, heresy, demanded uniformity for the preservation of the unity in the Church's witness, worship,

1 Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 84-85. 2 *Philippians*, 95.

3 "Presbyterian delegates desire to have it noted that the conception of the ministry held by their churches is founded on the identity of 'bishops' and 'presbyters' in the New Testament."—(*Report of Edinburgh Conference*, 247).

4 P. 85 quoted in *Essays on the Christian Ministry*, 58.

and work. (*b*) The unity of the fellowship in the local community was secured by the emergence from the presbyterate of the bishops—a stage represented by Ignatius. (*c*) The unity of the testimony to the world was secured by the appeal to the Churches claiming to have been founded by Apostles, and so to possess and preserve the apostolic tradition; of this tradition the bishop as representing the Church, was the guardian and the exponent—a view specially stressed by Irenaeus. (*d*) The unity in fellowship and witness of the Churches was secured by the Synod or Council of bishops; this, so long as the bishop's claims rested on his representing his Church, was a legitimate development; illegitimate (according to this view) is the Cyprianic claim for the bishop as belonging to a higher order and having an inherent authority.

(3) In this historical development it is possible to recognize the divine providence, the guidance of the Spirit of God. In Cyprian there was a relapse to pagan and Jewish conceptions. While there is a historical continuity between the "old" and the "new covenant", there is still more contrast, because the preparatory progressive revelation in the Hebrew nation has become the consummating perfect revelation in the Incarnate Word. The Church is no longer under the bondage of law, but in the freedom of the Spirit. For me this Anglo-Catholic theory of the episcopate is Judaistic, sub-Christian; and a like lapse may be assigned to any theory which would permanently bind the Church to any one church polity as having the authority of the New Testament. Canon Streeter has shown that no polity can claim that authority, and that aspects of each—episcopal, presbyteral, or congregational—can be found.

> There is not sufficient agreement among scholars to give hope of unity through such an appeal; and there are those who hold that more than one form of Order can be illustrated from the New Testament[5].

The argument for the Episcopate in this Report is given in this sentence (p. 121):

> The Historic Episcopate has a position as an organ of continuity which belongs, in fact, to no other order of Ministry in that it early became the one recognized order for transmitting the ministerial commission and that for more than a thousand years it alone held the field.

The Church of England is not committed to any one theory and its clergy are not required to assent to any.

(4) In "An Appeal to All Christian People" of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 the claim is made[6] that

> the Episcopate is the one means of providing a ministry acknow-

[5] *Doctrine of the Church of England*, 117.
[6] Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, 3

> ledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body;

and the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Nonconformists at Lambeth in May, 1922, endorsed this claim (pp. 149-50):

> In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby the authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

This is, however, supplemented:

> Similarly in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

(5) To those who, relying as they believe on the continued guidance by the Spirit of the individual believer, attach no importance to sacraments, ordination, duly commissioned ministry, the historical continuity of the Church, the restoration of its broken unity, such an argument will make no appeal. But responsible representatives of the Churches in England have agreed that if there is ever to be the United Church, such in their judgment should be its polity. By accepting the renewed invitation of the Lambeth Conference in 1930 the Free Churches of England have committed themselves, not to final acceptance, but to further explorations of the possibility of such a Church. *The Outline of a Reunion Scheme* which has recently been commended to the attention of the Churches, is accordingly no breach of the conditions under which the Churches hitherto have been tacitly assenting to the continuance of the Joint Conference at Lambeth, but a more precise indication of what that possibility seems to be to those who have framed it. No unqualified assent to it can be expected; nor is it desired, as many of its details will appear unacceptable; but an unqualified repudiation in principle would impose such restrictions on the conversations as to imperil their continuance —a result which the Churches will, it is to be hoped, hesitate in precipitating.

(6) In defence of the divisions of Christendom it has sometimes been maintained that each has served to emphasize some necessary aspect of "the truth and grace" of Christ. Applying this consideration to polity, it may be argued that episcopacy, presbytery, and congregation are all modes of administration which have proved their value. If so, should there not be greater gain from their combination, if

possible, than from their separation? In the present historical situation, this reasonable claim can in my judgment be made; and, therefore, the exploration of the possibility is an urgent duty while the "Catholic" theory is unreservedly rejected. Nevertheless, we must not allow ourselves to forget that the unity and the continuity of the Church of Christ does not ultimately depend on any organization, necessary as organization is; but on the constant presence in His body of the Head, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day, yea, and for ever", the one Saviour and Lord, and on the continued guidance by the life-giving Spirit, the Spirit of Truth. As a human society, the Church must look backward and outward, but as a divine agency she must look inward and upward; and so recapture the experience of the primitive community in the assurance: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth; and lo, I am with you all the days unto the consummation of the age". (*Matt.* $28^{18, 20}$; R.V. margin.)

WAS THE DOUBLE USE OF "SON OF MAN" A FACTOR IN THE DEIFICATION OF JESUS?

By the Rev. H. Bulcock, M.A., B.D.

It used to be perhaps too readily assumed that the term "Son of Man" in the Gospels was a title definitely claimed by Jesus for Himself individually and with a specific Messianic import. The following study suggests that Jesus, following the precedent in *Daniel*, used the term in a *collective* sense; that He did not apply it to Himself as an individual in a specific and exclusive way; that it was not for Him a Messianic title, although at a very early date His interpreters, anxious to identify Him with the Messiah, and familiar with such an identification of the Son of Man in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, came to think of it as a personal title for Jesus; that the Parousial expectation gathered around this use of the term, and that in the extension of Christianity into Gentile circles the term Son of Man gained certain features from a current myth of an "Anthropos" cult.

I.

The Personification of the Saints of the Most High.

It is natural to connect the New Testament use of the phrase with *Dan.* 7, where in the dramatic imagery of world events there appears, following the mention of various world powers symbolized by beasts, "one like unto a Son of Man" to whom is given an everlasting kingdom. In 7^{18} the "one like unto a Son of Man" is obviously identified with "the saints of the Most High" who, though "worn out" by their oppressors (7^{25}) for a period designated as "a time, and times and half a time" (three and a half times?), finally receive the kingdom and dominion for ever. That no reference to a personal Messiah was ever intended by the original writer of *Dan.* appears from the fact that no personal "Son of Man" appears further in the story. The future deliverer of the nation preceding a general resurrection is Michael ($12^{1, 2}$). Peake comments[1]:

> It is possible of course that originally the figure of the Son of Man may have been individual rather than collective, and that the collective significance as we find it in *Daniel* has been imposed on the original sense.

The Enochian "Son of Man".

There seems to be a reversion to this original individual figure in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, dated by Charles in the first century B.C.,

[1] *The Messiah and the Son of Man*, 21 n.

where the Son of Man appears as a definite personal being identified with the Messiah. Enoch sees one who has the countenance of a man, who is in the company of the Ancient of Days. It is explained to Enoch that this is

> the Son of Man who hath righteousness; the Lord of spirits hath chosen him; he can reveal the hidden treasures of righteousness; he shall be a light of the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled of heart.

He is described as the Christ (48^{10}), the Righteous One (38^{2}), the Elect One (40^{5}), as well as the Son of Man. In *Dan.* God is Judge, and the "one like unto a Son of Man" only appears after the judgment to receive his kingdom, but in the *Similitudes* the "Son of Man" is Judge. The Lord of spirits sets him on the throne of his glory; the spirit of righteousness is poured upon him; the word of his mouth slays sinners; the unrighteous are destroyed before his face. Their countenances fall and pain seizes them when they see the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. The kings and the mighty petition him for mercy but it is too late; the angels of punishment carry them to their appointed doom. But the righteous are saved on that day; the Lord of spirits will abide with them and with that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever (62, *cf.* 69, 27). The parallels with the apocalyptic Christ of the New Testament are obvious.

The Anti-Christ and the Suffering Saints.

The picture of the triumphant Son of Man of the *Similitudes* is part of a larger cosmic conception in which more stress is laid upon the opposition of Anti-Christ and the sufferings of the righteous. The legend of Anti-Christ possibly goes back to the Babylonian myth of Marduk and the rebellious Tiamat; there is the Persian version of Ahura-Mazda contending with Angra Mainyu[2]. This idea penetrated Jewish apocalyptic literature, where God strives with the devil incarnate in the forms of Beliar, Diabolus, and the Spirit of the Air. We may connect this conflict with the imagery of *Dan.* 7, with its specific reference to a period of persecution of the "saints of the Most High", lasting three and a half times. Since the ultimately triumphant Son of Man is also identical with the "saints of the Most High" we have the important idea of the Son of Man, the collective figure of the "saints of the Most High", suffering for three and a half "times" ("years" or "days"?) but finally coming to his kingdom. There is thus a relation between the "Woes" or "Birth-Pangs" of the Messiah, and a suffering Son of Man. This period is only hinted at in the *Similitudes,* but obviously the kings and the mighty ones who meet their doom at the coming of the Son of Man have

2 See Bousset, "Anti-Christ", in *E.R.E.*

exercised a previous temporary authority and tyranny over the righteous.

It is conceivable that the Suffering Servant passage of *Isa.* 53 may have been part of the same tradition. Like the Son of Man in *Dan.*, the "Servant" is personal in form but collective in significance. He is particularly representative of an idealized Israel, even as the *Daniel* figure represents "the saints of the Most High". The former has endured persecution; the latter has been despised, rejected, bruised, afflicted. The "saints of the Most High" under the figure of the "one like unto a Son of Man" receive the dominion; so the righteous kernel of Israel, the Isaian "Servant of the Lord" shall "see his seed, prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand".

The "Two-Witnesses" Apocalypse in Rev. 11.

There is further evidence of such a tradition embedded in *Rev.* 11. Although this is a Christian apocalypse, there is internal evidence that the tradition here introduced is independent of the events found in the Christian gospels, and is presumably earlier or it would have shown more marks of influence by the Christian story. Bousset finds this apocalyptic fragment another version of the Anti-Christ tradition.

There are two "witnesses" who have power to shut the heavens that it rain not (Elijah?) and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood and to smite the earth with every plague as often as they shall desire (Moses?). When they have finished their testimony the beast comes out of the abyss to make war on them, overcome them, and kill them. Their dead bodies lie in the street of the great city spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified. Men from all nations look upon their unburied bodies for three days and a half; they will not suffer their bodies to be laid in a tomb and their downfall is a cause of rejoicing. After the three days and a half the breath of life from God enters into them; they rise up; great fear falls upon those who behold; the resurrected "witnesses" ascend into heaven in a cloud in the sight of their enemies (*Rev.* $11^{3\text{-}13}$).

The significant features of this fragment are: (i) the two "witnesses" who are overcome by the beast from the abyss, slain, and after three days rise again are identified in some way with Moses and Elijah. There is not one figure, "the Son of Man" symbolic of the "saints of the Most High", but two representatives of the class; (ii) these details are obviously *not* suggested by details of the death and resurrection of Jesus in the gospel narratives: there are *two* witnesses; the period between their death and resurrection is three and a half days (the period between Christ's death and resurrection in the gospel accounts is one day, two nights, and parts of two days);

their bodies are not suffered to be buried. The tradition is clearly independent of the gospel story in its origin, and apart from the phrase "where also their Lord was crucified" probably pre-Christian. (iii) The two witnesses who suffer and later enter into triumph are parallel to the "saints of the Most High" in the *Dan.* passage. We have the significant picture forming of a Son of Man who bears his witness, is overcome by the evil one, is put to death but after three days rises again and ascends to his glory. (iv) We have apparently a parallel version of the tradition in the gospel logion of a Son of Man who should be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth (*Mt.* 12^{40}), a period curiously inconsistent with the *two* nights, one day and parts of two days in the gospel account of the death and resurrection of Jesus. One also notes the mention of Moses and Elijah in the Transfiguration story (see later).

II.

Double New Testament Conception of the Triumphant Son of Man and the Suffering Son of Man.

In the *Similitudes* the Messianic Son of Man is triumphant Conqueror and Judge. He is Deliverer of the suffering righteous, but he himself shows no weakness and endures no suffering. But while the Son of Man in *Dan.* is ultimately triumphant, the triumph only follows a period of his suffering and persecution at the hands of Anti-Christ (*cf.* the "two witnesses" of *Rev.* 11). With such a double conception, many who held Messianic hopes at the time of Jesus did not readily conceive a suffering Messiah, although, when it was pointed out to them, they could see that their religious literature contained the teaching that "Christ must suffer and enter into his glory" (*Lk.* $24^{25\text{-}27}$).

As a matter of fact, in the New Testament we find exactly this double conception of the Son of Man. There is the Parousial figure, as in the *Similitudes*, a Christ coming in glory, treading down the powers of evil, judging the quick and the dead, striking terror in the hearts of the enemies of the righteous, and establishing a kingdom of everlasting blessedness for the saints.

But there is also the other conception of the *suffering* Son of Man, who comes to his triumph only through persecution, death, and resurrection. Following the confession at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus "began to teach that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and scribes and after three days rise again" (*Mk.* 8^{31}). The statement is repeated after the Transfiguration (*Mk.* 9^{9}). The prediction of suffering, death, and resurrection after three days recurs in the secret passage through Galilee (9^{31}) and on the journey to Jerusalem ($10^{32, 34}$). The Passover arrives when "the Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified" (*Mt.* 26^{2}).

The stages of the betrayal are linked with the mention of the Son of Man (*Mk.* 14[21, 41], *Lk.* 22[48]). The women at the sepulchre are reminded by the angel of how Jesus spoke to them in Galilee saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men and be crucified and on the third day rise again (*Lk.* 24[7]).

These sayings are referred back to previous writings. "The Son of Man goeth *as it is written* of him"; "*it is written* that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be set at nought". To Elijah has been done "whatso they have listed, *as it is written* of him". What are these writings predicting the sufferings of the Son of Man, and of Elijah[3]? *Isaiah* 53, with its striking picture of the Suffering Servant of the Lord, the personification of righteous Israel, may be counted among these, but it has no reference to Elijah or to a specific Son of Man; and one seeks the explanation of the words "It is written" in an apocalyptic Son of Man literature, of which the extant fragment of *Rev.* 11 may be typical.

Did Jesus Use the Term "Son of Man" in a Collective Sense?

We have apparently in the pre-Christian period the use of the term "Son of Man" in two different senses, (i) as a personification and collective symbol of the righteous, "the saints of the Most High"; (ii) a supernatural individual, an archangel, one of the heavenly powers who in some Jewish circles seemed identified with the Messiah, although the use of the term would by no means convey the Messianic significance to the average Jew. Is the term used with this double significance in the New Testament? In our present records the "Son of Man" has unquestionably gained a personal significance; the term is a title for the historical Jesus and for the coming Christ of the Parousia; but certain phenomena hint at an earlier use with the *collective* significance of the righteous in Israel, now despised and rejected, but finally inheriting the Kingdom.

(1) *Use without arousing Messianic expectation.* We are struck by the fact that the use of the term by Jesus before the conversation at Caesarea Philippi apparently did not carry a personal Messianic implication in the ears of the people or of the disciples. If understood in a collective sense, of course, it would not.

(2) *Appropriateness of a collective sense.* A collective significance for "the saints of the Most High" best suits the context in the two instances given in *Mark* before the incident of Caesarea Philippi:

(*a*) *Mk.* 2[10ff]. Jesus claims that it is easier to assure a sinner of pardon than to heal his physical disability. He does the latter and harder thing to justify the former and more natural thing. The "Son of Man" (not Jesus exclusively) hath power on earth to declare to a sinner, being penitent, the forgiving love of God. It is "a word

[3] See later for the connexion between the two.

which might have been spoken by any man" (A. B. Bruce). The whole argument is that such authority is a prerogative of grace for the saints of the Most High, and not merely for Jesus Himself.

(*b*) *Mk.* 2^{28}. "The Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath". Jesus was justifying the action of the *disciples* in plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath. "Jesus by his argument, though He would include Himself, would not exclude others" (Driver).

(3) There are several other passages which admit of a similar non-exclusive sense:

(*a*) *Mt.* 8^{20} (*Lk.* 9^{58}). A passage from *Q*. "Foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head"—a deterrent to a would-be follower. The "Son of Man" is not necessarily Jesus exclusively; on the other hand, not "man" in general (*barnasha*) but the special class of the "saints" subject to privations and discomforts involved in their sacrificial fidelity to right.

(*b*) *Mk.* 10^{45}. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many". We may compare the description of the Isaian Servant—a collective figure for righteous Israel—"Surely he hath borne our griefs" *etc.*, and several passages in *Maccabees*. One of the seven brothers prays that "in me and my brothers the wrath of the Almighty may be appeased" (*2 Macc.* 7^{38}); "Let my blood serve as purification, and as equivalent for the life of my people (ἀντίψυχον) take my own" (*4 Macc.* 6^{29}). The "ransom" of *Mk.* 10 then need not be regarded as exclusive to Jesus in the light of this current doctrine. It can be the result of the vicarious sacrifice of the "saints". The suffering of the righteous should atone for and save the community (*cf.* also *Col.* 1^{24}).

(*c*) *Lk.* 6^{22} (*Q*). "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you . . . for the Son of Man's sake" (*Mt.* 5^{4} "for my sake"), may reasonably refer to persecution through fidelity to the cause of the Kingdom of the "saints of the Most High".

(*d*) *Mt.* 12^{32} (*Lk.* 12^{10}). "Whoso speaketh a word against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him, but whoso speaketh against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him". *Mk.* $3^{28\text{-}30}$ (*Mt.* 12^{31}) gives the variant—"All sins and blasphemies shall to the sons of men be forgiven" (*Mt.* "unto men"). One suggests (1) that the original was "Whoso speaketh a word against the Son of Man, *i.e.*, the righteous, it shall be forgiven him, but not so, the one who blasphemes God speaking through the Holy Spirit. The former is an outrage against man; the latter an outrage against God. (2) But later the term Son of Man became exclusively identified with Jesus and therefore the text became theologically objectionable. (3) So the text was turned into—"All sins and blasphemies shall to the sons of men be forgiven" (as in *Mk.* 3) but not without awkwardness, for the general

sense of the passage suggests a contrast between a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and the word spoken against another or others.

In all these cases the possible, and in certain instances the almost inevitable, interpretation is to be gained by regarding Jesus as identifying His disciples with Himself under the *collective* personification, the "Son of Man". We can understand how the term could be used in this way without creating either Messianic interest or hostile personal criticism. Its use is consistent with the apparent strict suppression of personally exclusive or Messianic claims in the early ministry at any rate.

(4) There are further phenomena which suggest that the Coming of the Son of Man was meant to indicate the triumph of the saints, the victory of righteousness against its adversaries.

(*a*) *The use of the first and third Persons together.* This suggests a distinction between the historical Jesus and the Son of Man at his coming.

(i) *Mt.* 19^{28}. "Ye which have followed *me,* in the regeneration when the *Son of Man* shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel".

(ii) *Mk.* 8^{38}. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me . . . of him shall the *Son of Man* be ashamed when he cometh".

(iii) *Mk.* 14^{62}. "And Jesus said, I am (the Christ), and ye shall see the *Son of Man* sitting at the right hand of power". J. E. Carpenter comments[4]—

> It is remarkable that Jesus should never say "Ye shall see *me* coming". Why should he name an apocalyptic symbol, not himself? If however the "Coming of the Son of Man" signifies the coming of the saints of the Most High to their kingdom and the triumph of righteousness over the forces of evil oppression, the passages may bear an intelligible sense.

(*b*) *Jesus who has already come speaks of the Son of Man to come.*

(i) *Mt.* 10^{23}. Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come (*cf.* 16^{28}).

(ii) *Mt.* 24^{14}. In an hour ye think not the Son of Man cometh (*cf.* 24^{27}, 25^{31}; Lk. 17^{30}).

(5) *The possible association with the classical "saints of the Most High", e.g.,* Elijah, Moses, Jeremiah or one of the prophets.

(*a*) In the fragment of *Rev.* 11, the "two witnesses" have the functions of Moses and Elijah. They are outstanding representatives of the "saints of the Most High", at first persecuted and slain; then gloriously triumphant. Although the specific term Son of Man is not mentioned, the relation of this passage to the Son of Man conception has already been noticed.

[4] *The First Three Gospels,* 369.

(*b*) *Mt.* 16[13]. *Who do men say that the Son of Man is?* This form is peculiar to *Mt.* The parallel of *Mk.* is "Who do men say that I am" and of *Lk.* "Who do the multitudes say that I am?" The *A.V.* of *Mt.* 16[13] runs—"Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" Bruce (*Exp. G.T.*) remarks:

> It would seem simpler and more natural to ask who do men say that I am (με εἶναι *Mk.* and *Lk.*). It is intrinsically unlikely that Jesus would combine the two forms of the question as in the T.R. It is significant that the best MSS. leave out the με.

But why then is there this departure from *Mk.* and *Lk.'s* form? N. Schmidt thinks that *Mt.* has preserved an earlier text than *Mk.* or *Lk.* At any rate, it seems strange that the more natural text of *Mk.* or *Lk.* should have this variant. It suggests an older text with an *original different meaning.* If we could read vv. 13 and 14 in *Mt.* 16 by themselves ("Who do men say that the Son of Man is? And they said: Some say, John the Baptist, some Jeremiah or one of the prophets"), keeping our minds free from the parallels in *Mk.* and *Lk.* and the later individualistic and Christological associations of the term Son of Man, we should take the words to signify that the *"Son of Man" popularly indicated such people as the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah or one of the prophets.* Jesus seeks in the words that follow to *contrast* the Son of Man and the Messiah. Jesus appears to be claiming to be one other than the Son of Man which has so broad a meaning as to include so many people. "Who say ye that *I* am?" Peter's answer virtually signifies—"You are not merely one of the saints of the Most High—you are the Messiah, the Son of the living God". This is in harmony with the fact that Jesus could speak freely of the Son of Man before making a Messianic claim. The Messiah was a further and more exclusive term indicating the one with a special function in that generation.

(*c*) *Mk.* 9[9-13]. Jesus and three disciples had witnessed the vision of Moses and Elijah (the "two witnesses" of *Rev.* 11?) in glory on the mountain of transfiguration. According to *Lk.*, the conversation of Moses and Elijah with Jesus was concerned with His future sufferings which He should accomplish at Jerusalem. It was a fitting theme, for the apocalyptic tradition had evidently presented Moses and Elijah as bearing a witness, suffering, being slain and after three days rising again. After Caesarea Philippi this subject was frequently on the lips of Jesus (*Mt.* 16[21]) and the Transfiguration was dated six days after the conversation at Caesarea Philippi. It was the theme as Jesus and the three disciples came down from the mountain. "He charged them that they should tell no man what they had seen until the Son of Man should have risen from the dead". The phrase puzzled the disciples. But significantly they connected it somehow with Elijah, who in the apocalyptic tradition had been

slain and had risen again. They introduced their problem by referring to the scribes' expectation that a triumphant Elijah should restore all things. "But what is written about the Son of Man as well? This, that he is to endure great suffering and be rejected" (Moffatt's translation of *Mk.* 9^{12}). The subject of the statement in 9^{12a} is Elijah; why should it abruptly become Jesus in 9^{12b} (if the term "Son of Man" should be applicable only to Him)? But, actually, is not a contrast being drawn between the *triumphant* and the *persecuted* Son of Man, "the saints of the Most High", as represented in the case of one of them, Elijah? "Is it only said of the Son of Man that he should restore all things—what is written about the Son of Man as well? Namely that he must endure great suffering and be rejected". With such an interpretation 9^{13} follows naturally—"I say unto you that Elijah is come and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed even as it is written of him" (in the apocalyptic tradition?). The sufferings of Elijah seem identified with the sufferings of the collective Son of Man.

6. *The problem of the disciples being unprepared for Christ's personal resurrection after repeated predictions of a risen Son of Man.* According to the gospels Jesus repeatedly foretells the suffering, rejection, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man, and yet in the attitude and behaviour of the disciples and followers immediately after the death of Jesus, a situation of dismay and despair, there seems to have been no preparation in their minds for the things which were happening. This is amazing if Jesus had been repeatedly declaring His own personal death and resurrection. Did Jesus mean, and was He understood by the disciples as meaning, not His own personal death and resurrection, but the persecutions and revival of the Kingdom of the saints of the Most High under the ancient figure of the Son of Man? This might also explain the puzzling feature of Jesus going up to Jerusalem, not to perish but to make a bid for the Kingdom[5].

(7) *The Saints judging the World.* The Son of Man is presented as Judge at the Parousia. This does not narrow down the significance of the Son of Man to a single person. In the regeneration when the Son of Man should sit on the throne of his glory, the disciples should be found sitting on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel. In the light of the apocalyptic tradition Paul writes (*1 Cor.* $6^{2, 3}$): "Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world . . . know ye not that we shall judge angels?"

(8) *The Coming of the Son of Man—the Coming of the Kingdom.* In several passages (*Mt.* 10^{23}. "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man is come." *Cf. Mt.* 24^{27}) it seems natural to conceive the "coming of the Son of Man" as the appear-

[5] Goguel, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 203.

ance of the Messianic Kingdom. The parallels of *Mt.* 16[28] are interesting. Whereas this passage reads "There be some that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom", *Mk.* simply says "till they see the Kingdom of God come with power" (9[1]) and *Lk.*, "till they see the Kingdom of God" (9[27])[6].

SUMMARY.

There is much then to suggest that Jesus used the term Son of Man in the *collective* sense of *Dan.*7, *i.e.*, as a personification of the righteous to whom should be given the everlasting kingdom. He included the disciples with Himself in the term, although His own position of leader would tend to encourage the transition to the idea of Himself as *the* Son of Man. The term as presumably currently understood could be applied to men of righteous heroism in the past—Elijah, Jeremiah, and the Prophets. With these ranked John the Baptist. Jesus accepted this identification and distinguished the Son of Man from the Messiah. Jesus prophesied the ultimate glory and triumph of the people of God in Danielesque fashion as the "Coming of the Son of Man".

There was an apocalyptic tradition that the Son of Man, the collective term for the righteous people, should suffer persecution and death, but rise again after "time and times and half a time" (*Dan.* 7[25]) or "three and a half days" (*Rev.* 11). This expressed the spiritual triumph of the righteous after seeming defeat and disaster. Christ's own experiences led Him to stress this tradition in the later stages of His ministry. He never intended, we may believe, to predict His own physical resurrection, which apparently came to the disciples as an altogether unexpected event, which would have been strange had Jesus so definitely foretold it in this personal sense time after time, as the evangelists state. The resurrection of Jesus (probably some psychical experience of the disciples) *within* three days, and the resurrection of the righteous nation, "the Son of Man", *after* three days suggest that the tradition of the latter did not give rise to the invention of the former.

III.

COROLLARIES.

(1) *The Birth of Christian Second Adventism.*

The disciples at an early date came to regard Jesus as *the* Son of Man in a personal and exclusive sense, and to identify Him with the Messianic Son of Man in the *Similitudes*, a supernatural being who should manifest himself at a literal Parousia as Judge and Deliverer and Founder of the everlasting Kingdom. But at the death of Jesus the predictions of a glorious triumphant Messiah had not been fulfilled. The actual course of history resulting in the ignominious

[6] See Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 140.

death of the Messiah upon a cross, and the expectations of a Messiah coming in glory upon the clouds as predicted in the *Similitudes*, could only be reconciled by the doctrine that Jesus must come again in different fashion. This is probably the psychological origin of *Second* Adventism. The apocalyptic utterances found in the gospels may well have originated in things which Jesus actually said, but it does not follow that Jesus, speaking in the collective sense of apocalyptic, more or less figuratively and parabolically, meant what His followers meant. There are indications that the early community elaborated simpler sayings of Jesus in a developed apocalyptic direction. It seems pretty clear that current apocalypses were grafted among the authentic sayings, *e.g.*, the "Little Apocalypse" of *Mk.* 13.

(2) *The transformed idea of the "Son of Man" as a factor in the deification of Jesus.*

A belief in an angelic hierarchy was consistent with Jewish monotheism. The Messiah could be regarded as an angelic "Son of Man" as in the *Similitudes*. But in the passage of the term into Gentile circles there was a not unnatural tendency to identify the angelic Messianic Son of Man with some features of another Son of Man familiar to Gentile minds. We can judge this circle of thought from certain writings which although they cannot be too confidently dated probably throw light on the mentality of the Gentile world about the dawning of the Christian era.

An "Anthropos" Cult.

In the Hermetic *Poimandres* there appears the figure of Anthropos, as one of the three emanated sons of the Supreme God. His brothers are the Logos, the divider of the elements, and Demiurgus Nous, the maker of the heavenly bodies and the lower mortal and irrational living creatures. Anthropos is responsible for the creation of rational man, who in some way has issued from God and is destined to go back to God. The scheme outlined in the *Poimandres* seems an eclectic one, an attempt to set into some sort of relationship theologies and cults already in the field. The significance of the mention of three emanated deities with somewhat similar creative functions seems to be the recognition of three similar and possibly rival cults which the author is seeking to harmonize in a syncretic unity. And for our purpose, the existence of an "Anthropos" cult is of special interest.

The Cosmic "Son of Man".

Further evidence of this cult seems offered by the wide prevalence of the idea of a primitive representative Man. Bousset devotes one of his chapters in the *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* to the subject of the *Urmensch*. He sums up (p. 215):

> There was a primitive myth, perhaps associated with an old fertility cult, according to which the world is pictured as deriving its life through the sacrifice of the Primitive Man. This myth gains a new meaning in its contact with the Greek world of thought. In the beginning of the world-creation the sacrificed Primitive Man becomes the Protanthropos, the firstborn of the highest God, the deuteros theos, who in the beginning of the world-development, sinks into matter or becomes bound up with matter.

The idea of a transcendental Man or Son of Man appears in various Gnostic systems; *The Heavenly Dialogue* quoted by Celsus tells that the god Yaldabaoth is reminded by Sophia his mother that above him were the father of all, the first man, and the Son of Man. The Pauline "first Adam" (*Rom.* 5^{12-21}, *1 Cor.* $15^{20-22, 45-49}$) may be a form of the *Urmensch* tradition. This Hermetic or Gnostic Son of Man is in origin and nature obviously independent of the Son of Man in the first three gospels. He is a deity akin to the emanated Logos.

In the Fourth Gospel the use of the term Son of Man has closer affinities with the idea of deity of the Anthropos or Logos type. Driver comments:

> The term Son of Man is applied in the Fourth Gospel to Christ not only with reference to His life on earth as man but *with reference to His pre-existence with God*; it is not used in John with reference to the Second Advent (contrast the Synoptics).

The Son of Man has come down from heaven (3^{13}) whither he will return again (6^{22}). He becomes identical with the mystical Christ, realized in the sacrament ($6^{27, 53}$). He is in continual communion with the Father (1^{51}). He will be lifted up and those who believe on Him will have eternal life (3^{13}).

Has then the identification of Jesus with the Messianic supernatural "Son of Man" in the Similitudes of Enoch led in Hellenistic circles to a conception of Christ as a "second god", an emanated Son of Man, akin to the Logos, and with Logos nature and functions? Is the varied use of this ambiguous term the clue to that striking Christological development to be traced even within the New Testament pages from Jesus as a Galilean prophet preaching the coming of the Kingdom of God to the Logos Christ found in Paul, in the Fourth Gospel and other New Testament writings, and in the Creeds and beliefs of the Church?

HOME COUNTRY.

By Reg. W. Ford.

I have lived in the same town all my life. It is a fairly large town, but not so large that its citizens cannot feel for its welfare a personal interest. Many of them, in fact, take immense pride in it; although, unfortunately, that same pride sometimes blinds them to blemishes which are obvious to a detached observer. They go unremedied because they are seen at too close quarters—as witness the protests called forth from the city fathers by an airman who dared to criticize the unplanned state of the suburbs as they appeared from the clouds.

Yet, although I was born here, I do not feel for this, my "home town", quite so deep a regard as local patriotism apparently demands; for, notwithstanding that I have always lived in the same street even, in this same town, I nevertheless feel that it is not my true home. That lies some dozen or more miles to the south-west, half in another county. I have never resided there; excepting one week's holiday I have never stayed there for longer than a single day at a time. Neither does any house now remain in which I should find myself amongst my close kin—although at one or two I should probably be welcomed if I introduced myself. But there is my home. There my forefathers lived "from time immemorial"—carters, wood-cutters, tillers of the soil—old, uneducated, honest men. Many of them must lie beneath scarcely perceptible mounds in the little burial ground of the old Countess of Huntingdon's chapel, which was built by a descendant of William the Conqueror's mole-catcher. He, too, rests in confidence there, under a stone which proudly declares:

Christ victorious,
Satan vanquished.
Here, Earth, take thy part of
JOHN MULFORD,
Committed to thy trust until
"The last loud trumpet's wondrous sound
Shall through the rending tombs rebound,
And wake the nations underground."
Born October 1st, 1720. Died January 7th, 1814.
Gone to know more, adore more, love more.
Christian reader,
Trust a promise-performing God.

Surely such an inscription befits the servant of a King—that regal granting to Earth of the privilege of guarding his dust and keeping it safely until the Last Day. The man knew to Whom he belonged. Beside him

. . . lays (*sic*) the mortal part of
JOHN WHITBURN,
That faithful labourer of Christ,
Who died the 8th of December, 1803,
Aged 60.
First preacher of the Gospel at this place.

Badly did the poor folk here need the Gospel at that time; for a contemporary writer says that the inhabitants of the Common were "profane and atrocious even to a proverb. . . . The name of the Lord Jesus was scarcely known in those parts". Evil deeds were followed by merciless retribution. I have looked into a hole in a field, still called Gibbet Piece, where was planted the last gallows in the district. The register of Padworth for 1787 says that

> Abraham Tull aged 19 and upwards and William Hawkins aged about 17 years were hung in chains on Mortimer Common for the bloody wilful & inhuman murder of William Billimore of Ufton.

The gibbet was so placed that it could be seen from the windows of the lads' homes, that the parents, every time they looked out, might be reminded of their sons' dishonour. Later, a compassionate gentlewoman had the bodies taken down and given decent burial; but the irons were preserved and are still shown in Reading Museum.

Farther up the road, amidst the pinewoods, are the saw mills, owned by a distant relative of mine. The aromatic dust makes one sneeze, and the steam from the boiler drifts dazzlingly white across the dark fringe of trees. Flap, flap, go the leather driving belts, and the purr whines *crescendo* to an ear-splitting shriek as the rollers carry the trunks forward on to the teeth of the whirling blades. (Which reminds one of the hoary, but none the less good, story of the Irishman, who was asked how one of his fingers came to be missing. "Why, yer honour", he said, " 'twas thus. . . . An', begorra, there's another one gone!")

Down in the bottom is the little stream, which gives its name to the tiny valley, and to the farm beside it at which my only holiday was spent. The smell of a wood fire will always conjure up the recollection of my aunt's kitchen, with the wind puffing the blue smoke down the wide chimney, to eddy around the cat on the hearthrug, and vanish in slowly circling wreaths out of the always open door.

Those were the days of the delights of riding up the hill on the broad back of one of the great horses, and of giving one's finger to the calf to suck. I knelt by the brook, too, and angled with my fingers in the clear water. Once I actually caught a fish, which, judging by the filaments streaming from its mouth, may have been a small barbel. I was sad when the week ended, and I had to leave it swimming tirelessly round and round the white-flowered water weed

in the jam-jar on the window sill. Like Tom in *The Water Babies,* I have constantly yearned to be able, fish-wise, to glide in and out of the waving fronds in the cool depths of a summer stream, to explore that shady green world of crystal and silver.

Over the hay-fields came the sound of the mowing machine—and, be it truthfully recorded, the sustained and varied swearing of a highly-respected local preacher, as he tried to manœuvre some refractory horses! In the evening the air thrummed with the drumming of the falsely-named goatsuckers, otherwise nightjars: and sunny afternoons brought out beady-eyed lizards to bask in the dry bracken on the warm heaths: and long snakes slithered away into the crackling undergrowth, occasionally leaving their skins behind them. The other day I saw someone hysterically attack a pretty grass-snake, acting under the unreasoning impulse of that instinctive terror which possesses so many folk when they come across these harmless reptiles. Of all our English species, there is none to fear save the plainly recognizable adder. Yet this townsman had tried to kill the creature—not quickly, by stamping on its head, but by half-severing its body. The lovely markings were cruelly torn and bruised, like the wing of a handled butterfly. The swift tongue still darted, and I could discern no very baleful expression in the little glazing eyes. We put it out of its misery, and tossed it into the ditch. For a second the grey-green body hung from a twig, and then it dropped into the leafy bottom. So, unthinkingly, unreasonably, is beauty destroyed by those who fear it simply because it is strange to them, and because foolish, uninformed people have told them lies and filled their minds with groundless fears.

Across the common, whose location can often be traced from afar, in dry summers, by the clouds of smoke on the horizon, a road approaches the walls of the City of the Atrebates, once a Roman settlement of considerable importance. Here is no second Pompeii, or even Verulamium; but the wheat grows thinner above the foundations of the streets and houses and temples marked on the Ordnance Survey. The muddy lane enters through bluebell-covered earthworks, raised by the Celtic Brythons some twenty-one centuries ago. Behind these the Romans founded their town, and they determined its irregular plan. The North Gate is a huge rent in the massive flint and stone-banded walls, which, now all overgrown with trees and ivy, enclose an area equal to that of old London. They were originally not less than twenty feet high, and even to-day, after centuries of erosion and despoliation, rise to twelve feet in many ranges[1]. Between the lane and the foot of the walls runs a fosse, which I have seen used as an archery butts. The arrows then were

[1] Since writing this the Office of Works has cleared, and to some extent repaired one stretch of wall, and its original construction is plainly to be seen.

sped by ladies in sport, but in the old days many must have been winged across this same ditch with deadlier intent.

At the angle of the North and East walls a gateway, formerly called "Onion's Hole", from a giant of that name who is said to have made it his home, gives access to the amphitheatre. This is an oval earthwork, quite small. The grassy banks, which formed the tiers for the audience, are now covered with twisted trees and a tangle of undergrowth, while a half-timbered cottage stands opposite the entrance. It is doubtful if this soil was ever watered with the blood of gladiatorial combats; it was more probably used by the inhabitants as a sports ground, with wild-beast shows as an occasional treat.

The Parish church of Silchester, which is not far from the site of a Christian church of the 4th century, abuts on to a farm-yard at the East Gate, through which runs the now exorcised and grass-grown Devil's Highway. Thereafter the walls leave the comparatively modern road, and traverse the fields westwards. When in the 5th century the legions abandoned the city, forgetting an eagle standard in their haste, the already enfeebled townsfolk fell an easy prey to Ella's conquering hordes, and the Roman *Calleva Atrebatum* gave place to the Saxon *Selcaester*. Now the owl comes forth from the crumbling walls, and the magpies re-echo the chatter of the Forum. But in the twilight, when tall plumed grasses wave silhouetted against the overcast sky, it is not difficult to imagine that sentries still pace the bastions. And the trees, bending beneath the low, driving rain-clouds, whisper to one another that the enemy comes:

> The enemy is again at the gates. We are the enemy, with our creeping roots and clawing limbs. The grass below is the enemy, pushing between the crevices of dovetailed flints, until, with an imperceptible heave in the night, they roll bounding to earth, and are covered by the shimmering blades. Life is the enemy, for it is stronger than death.

A farm waggon crunches and sways clumsily through the mire, and the murmurous leaves are quiet until it has passed by.

This is all a land of ruins and the scattered bones of history. They stand through the earth's thin skin like vertebræ, to remind us that to their backbone we owe our existence. They force up the hummocks of barrows, or prick right through as the shattered arch of a deserted church, or, beside a decrepit apple-tree, as a few bricks to mark where a hearth once glowed. The good lady at the Priory Farm at Pamber showed us a coffin on her lawn, and said, "Ay, an' they dug up eleven more in our cellar. Monks they were, as used to live here. Buried in great lead coff'ns they were. An' las' week they dug one up under the path jus' there. Four men it took to lift 'un out. Jus' some ol' dry bones—bit of a jaw there was, an' an arm. They mus' 've buried the coff'n an' laid 'im in it after:

'twas made to fit 'un, y' see''. The church was being repaired, and she told us how she had a great wooden ol' man a-lyin' on her drawing-room table ''so's the rats shan't nibble off his nose!'' The old man thus disrespectfully used was probably Henry de Pont, the founder of the alien Priory of Monks Sherborne in the reign of Henry I. In the fallen nave she showed us the door by which the monks entered the church from the conventual buildings, which used to stand on the site of her farm. And she pointed out the line of the moat which encircled them all, part of which was now her duck-pond.

But the chapel of the Knights Templar at Brimpton, just a mile or two away, was beyond her ken. And we left her to see at Mortimer a coffin older than any she could show:

+ VIII KL. OCTB. FVIT POSITVS AEGELPARDVS FILVS KYPPINGVS IN ISTO LOCO. BEATVS SIT OMO QVI ORAT PRO ANIMA EIVS + TOKI ME SCRIPSIT.

So runs the marginal legend. Aedelward is mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle, and Toki was a friend of King Canute. Good Protestants though ye be, pray for their souls. It costs you nothing, and is a simple way of earning a blessing, doing no harm if it does no good.

Padworth Church, again not far off, invites you to remember also in your prayers ''the nameless dead'' who were killed in a Civil War skirmish in a lane near-by, and who found unceremonious burial only a few inches below the surface of the graveyard. Prince Rupert, caught in his own ambush, and swept by a murderous fire from both hedges, lost many men and horses; and the river still yields rusty spear-heads and stirrup-irons, whilst at Padworth House they came upon the skeleton of a cavalryman and his horse.

Towards the Bath Road, some of the nineteen gables of Ufton Court break the sky-line of the trees. For three hundred years the Perkins family dwelt there—fasted on the fish from the terraced ponds beneath the hanging gardens, secreted recusant priests in their three hiding holes (in one of which firelocks were found beside the crucifix), provided a home for Pope's Belinda, dispensed bread and flannel to the needy on the Friday after the third Sunday in Lent, and left their monuments in Ufton church. And the River Kennet, a little more disciplined, perhaps, than in their day, flows slowly across the flat fields towards the Thames.

Other places there are in ''my'' country equally beloved; but I am not writing a guide book. On the contrary: I would jealously guard them from the profane gaze of idle tourists, notwithstanding that it has been through the agency of motor cars that I myself have grown better acquainted with them: but that is of necessity and not of choice. I cannot prevent you from finding the grey old mill at

Sherfield Loddon, nor will I deny you the view across the Kennet valley from Aldermaston Park, since for these you need not leave the main road. But bosom friends only will I take to see the sheep-washing pond, the site of the castle of the de la Beches at Beaumyss (a name of romance, if ever there was one !), and the fritillary meadow at ———. I will not have my secret places wantonly displayed to any who do not see in them what I see; for this is a sacred country of my own, which draws me as the place wherein I first saw the light will never do. In reality it was there that I was born, not here: I am the first town-bred generation, and the countryside of my fore-fathers is my heart's home.

This is in part a parable. We are all citizens of two countries, born in one, but having our true home in another, "afar beyond the stars". The wild rose, whose translucent petals float on the wind over the walls of a dead city, is the passing shadow of "the floure of peace, the rose that cannot wither". Looking out of the window of a dull house in a prosaic modern town we see "Hierusalem, our happie home . . . . . "

Thy terrettes and thy pinnacles
  With carbuncles doe shine;
Thy verie streetes are paved with gold
  Surpassing clear and fine;

Thy saints are crownd with glorie great.
  They see God face to face,
They triumph still, they still rejoyce;
  Most happie is their case. . . . .

With Henry Vaughan and William Blake and this author known only by his initials, F.B.P., with Schubert and Delius and Vaughan Williams, and many another, we know in our hearts that always our home is just beyond our present horizon, is not here, but *there*.

SOCIETY AND THE ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. Silvester Davies, M.A., B.D.

Can we understand the Atonement apart from society? To answer this question it is only necessary to bear in mind the fact that every man is a member of society and as a result his actions have some effect upon the lives of those who are associated with him. This fact complicates the question of forgiveness as it introduces a third party whose interests must be considered if justice is to be done. The most obvious illustration is the experience of parents who forgive too easily, only to discover that their children grow up to be unwelcome or dangerous members of society. Here it is easy to see that such forgiveness is fair neither to the children nor to those people with whom they are to associate later in life. The Atonement was an act of forgiveness, and as such was bound to have certain social results which demanded consideration in determining the conditions under which God could offer pardon to His erring children. A further suggestion that it is necessary to study the social aspect of the Atonement is found in the emergence of a new kind of society which was one of the results immediately following the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Previous discussion of the problem has made it clear that the only condition for the receipt of forgiveness is a true repentance for wrong done, as it was on this basis that Jesus offered pardon during His earthly ministry. The need for Calvary, however, still seems to be a problem and perhaps some attention to the social aspect may help to discover a solution of the difficulty.

One of the strong points of the penal theories is to be found in the view of sin as something so terrible that no ordinary means are adequate to deal with the situation caused by its presence. Long before Jesus the prophets had denounced sin with passion and eloquence. They had warned men of the danger of wrongdoing, but to a great extent their work was in vain since many did not heed their words. The experience of Jesus was similar in spite of the fact that He gained the ear of multitudes by the authority of His preaching and the quality of His life. After three years' work His followers remained few in number and even they had only a hazy idea of His purpose. It is useless, therefore, to regard sin as something which can be conquered by precept or example when the life and teaching of the Master could do so little. To understand the Atonement there must be no minimizing the power of sin and the very real threat which it offers to human happiness.

One evidence of the power of sin over men and women is to be seen in its disruptive effect upon society. It is not necessary in these

days to lay stress upon the fact that every man is dependent upon society for his well being. The years of depression all over the world have been an eloquent and tragic reminder of the fact that no man, or nation, lives to himself. Men also need friendship if life is to be lived at its fullest, so anything which hurts the social organism has serious consequences for all its members. This sin does, since the necessary foundation for social well-being is the right behaviour of the individuals in the society. Society exists in its present state because the powers of evil are kept in check in different ways. The effect of sin upon society is well illustrated by the present international situation in which we see the desire for peace gravely endangered by the suspicion and fear existing between the nations. Wrong has been done in the past with the result that the nations are not able to give each other the mutual trust which is essential to any successful co-operation for peace. In the industrial world and between individuals the same result is often to be seen. Sometimes active vengeance is forgone after an injury but even then there is often a slow drift from true friendship since the old relationship of friendly trust has been destroyed. It can only be restored by a certain spiritual daring on the part of the wronged one. This natural suspicion is one of the greatest barriers in the way of social progress, since men are so blinded by the vision of men's evil deeds that they can seldom see the adventure of faith as being worth a trial.

One result of the corruption of human society is the feeling of helplessness which comes to the ordinary man as he contemplates the task of healing the world's sickness. He is left with a sense of his own littleness in the face of the task to be accomplished. He seems to be caught up in a system which he cannot change since so many people are involved. Even though he may see certain things to be wrong it seems useless to change since it would mean that other people would seize the spoils while he suffered. Unfortunately this sense of futility is not confined to the feeling that society itself is corrupt. Men often find themselves in the grip of sins which they would like to conquer but somehow their best efforts fail and they are left with the belief that there is no power by which they can conquer.

The blunting of conscience which comes to the persistent wrong-doer has often been noticed. The people among whom Jesus lived and taught illustrate this effect, since neither His preaching nor His example availed to awaken their consciences. For some indeed Jesus Himself was the sinner, since they could not understand the love which prompted Him to heal even on the Sabbath. To-day there are people to whom a disinterested action is a sheer impossibility, and they cannot believe that others are ready to help for the sheer joy of helping. To arouse the blunted conscience special action seems necessary, especially as any ordinary intervention is likely to produce

anger at an unwarranted interference with the rights and liberties of the individual.

Such being the consequences of sin, it is not difficult to visualize the ultimate end if it had been allowed to progress, unchecked by any divine grace. Men could only have been driven further apart until every man's hand was against his fellow and society would have vanished in sheer chaos. The effect of suspicion, cynicism, and increasing moral blindness could have but one result, the ultimate extinction of the human race under conditions of extreme misery and fear. It was this threat and the failure of ordinary methods of persuasion which made the Cross necessary.

In endeavouring to understand what God sought to do through the Cross, it is necessary to consider His relation to human society. God is the creator of human society, but He has revealed Himself to men and thus entered into fellowship with them. There is a sense therefore in which He is actually a member of the society which depends on Him for its very existence. God therefore may be considered as affected by the well-being of the society to which He in some sense belongs. This suggestion is strengthened by Christ's teaching about the love of God, since love renders men liable to joy or sorrow according to the response to their love. God, however, is denied the friendship of many of His children and what that means can be left to the imagination of those who have lost a friend. The welcome given to the Prodigal Son is surely one indication of a keenly felt loss. Still more terrible is the fact that some, whom God loves as friends, have become His enemies, being full of bitterness towards Him. In addition to the breaking of friendship there is the sight of human suffering, some of it avoidable, which God must contemplate. The colossal horror of war, the misery of a long strike, the despair of a man cheated out of his savings, needless poverty and sickness, these and many other sorrows must have their effect on God. Even the sufferings of men as a result of their own personal wrong-doing must contribute to God's sorrow in sin even as the sight of Jerusalem made Jesus lament.

If such be a true picture of the consequences of God's love for men, it seems obvious that men could not be left to their own devices. To lose men's love for ever and to watch the gradual process of social decay would be intolerable for anyone who really loved men. God's own nature therefore must have driven Him to seek some way out of the impasse and led Him to contemplate the possibility of Calvary as something less terrible than an eternity of yearning for His errant children. Persuasion has failed, but if men could only be shown the terrible effect of sin upon God, there would come the necessary awakening of conscience and also the other necessary conditions for the establishment of a righteous society. In the very fact that God's happiness was involved in the well-being of human society lay God's opportunity.

One effect of the crucifixion was a new vision of the horror of sin. This was partly due to the life which Jesus had lived, since many knew Him as one who did God's will with gladness. His unwearied service to the people could not be forgotten and it threw the shame of the Cross into startling relief. Its effect also would lose nothing in the way of power when men remembered the kind of person most responsible for the crime which had been committed. In their way they were good men zealous for the service of God, and if sin could blind them till they came to believe that they were serving God by destroying Jesus what could be expected of other men? Also men began to gain some insight into God's vision of sin when they saw the lengths to which He was prepared to go in order to defeat it. Men saw how greatly He loved them, but also knew that not even for the sake of their friendship would he tolerate sin. The disciples also had their own special revelation of the Master's love for them in the price He had paid to help them in spite of their faults. The result for many was a revulsion against the horror of sin which nothing else could have effected. No longer could they tolerate the things which they had been doing, and they were determined to make the sacrifice worth while. It meant for many that they became ready to lose the sins they liked as well as those they hated. That was the first step towards victory.

In addition to the negative power of the Cross due to the revulsion against sin there is a positive power due to the inspiration of the love seen in it. Jesus, by revealing His love on Calvary, captured the devoted enthusiasm of His followers to a degree hitherto impossible. Jesus had always inspired the disciples by the quality of His love for them, but now He was able completely to replace the drab inspiration of duty. Work which had formerly been hard going against the collar now became a delight because self was forgotten in the joy of serving the Master who had done so much for them. Gratitude was part of the inspiration, since there was certainly a feeling that Jesus had endured a penalty which ought really to have been theirs. The feeling was true since Jesus did suffer in order to save men, and the tragedy was that they themselves had imposed the penalty by their blind refusal to heed the warning.

Another result was to be seen in the hope which Jesus awakened in men when the atoning work was completed through His resurrection. The powers of evil had seemed so strongly entrenched in human society that nothing could ever triumph over them. Now, however, men were able to see that sin's greatest weapon had been used against Jesus only to result in utter failure. Now indeed was the strong man overcome, with the result that the paralysing sense of futility departed from all those who came into touch with the living Christ. Cynicism was defeated and men set free for a life of adventurous faith strong in the fact that Christ had died but now lived again.

The new faith in the possibility of human redemption was not confined to the possibility in the man actually accepting it at a particular time. Each new convert was inspired with a new vision of human greatness. Before they had been very conscious of the fact that men were liable to be sources of trouble and anxiety because of their seemingly ineradicable selfishness. Afterwards they saw that there must be possibilities of immense good in them when God was willing to pay so great a price in order to develop them. No one is ready to pay a heavy price for an unworthy article, and God's action made apparent His own vision of men's value. Thus the disciples of Jesus began to realize something of the latent spiritual possibilities in men, with the result that they, at least, were willing to take risks in God's service. It is instructive to compare the pessimism of Isaiah and Amos with the splendid optimism and daring of the Apostles. The latter made a venture of faith in the belief that God could reform men and found their trust justified by the results obtained. With such a faith came the possibility of overcoming the corroding suspicion engendered by selfishness. The faith, of course, was strengthened by the actual experience of deliverance as every man who gained it though the Christ knew that it was possible for others also.

The new hope and faith was strengthened by the society which emerged in Jerusalem after the experience of Calvary. Here Jesus was able to demonstrate that it was possible to redeem a society as well as the individuals composing it. This is an important part of the Atonement, for it strikes directly at the root of that pessimism which hampers the work of anyone who is zealous for the Kingdom of God. It gave to the early Christians a wonderful example of the possibilities latent in their faith besides being a source of strength to new converts. The value of that society can hardly be exaggerated since it must have been an inspiration to the disciples to go out, not merely to gather one here and one there but to engage in the thrilling work of making the nation and the world more like the society created in Jerusalem by the living Christ. In distinction from the communities generally known, it was a creative influence for good. Men well knew the debasing influence of a corrupt society, but here was a living example of the fact that redeemed individuals coming together in a redeemed society were immediately knit together in a society which was itself redemptive. That surely was the completion of the atoning process for that day, and what remained was the extension on the widest possible scale of the work which had been achieved amongst the little company of believers in Jerusalem.

THE FRESHENING OF FAMILIAR TEXTS.

By the Rev. Arthur Wakelin.

There seems to be a fashion in sermonic texts as in other things. Forty years ago many a preacher would speak of the lily-work on the top of the temple pillars; but who would dare to announce that text to-day? A few years ago it was said that scarcely a student left the theological colleges without having in his repertoire a discourse on the Abundant Life; but who has heard that sermon lately?

There are other texts, however, which cannot be so easily discarded by changing fashions. These are the old standards on which every preacher worth his salt desires at some time or other to graft his roses. The difficulty with these texts is to treat them with any freshness, and for this reason experienced preachers become timid of them. A young minister, conversing with a much older colleague, was asked what he had preached on last Sunday. When the beginner had told him, the older man replied, "That is of no use to me; it has been preached on so many times". Fortunately the young man was not made of the stuff that could be discouraged by such a blind reply. He was aware that men are so constituted that surprise is necessary if attention and interest are to be secured. He had a wholesome memory of the gasfitter who, being asked why men do not go to church, replied, "Because they know the rigmarole beforehand"; and the young man was diligent in turning his messages into something more than a rigmarole. But he had also discovered that some texts are familiar just because they are packed with importance. He had learnt from an old Professor of Homiletics that "diamonds are never obsolete", and that "one of the most masterly successes of the pulpit is that of freshening an old story".

The text that his weary colleague had dismissed was:

> O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!

Can those words ever grow so familiar that it will be wise to leave them alone? Possibly; yet it is strange that, after hearing sermons for fifty years, I have never had the privilege of hearing one on those words, unless it has come from my own lips!

Even if the words were as familiar as the morning light or the daily bread, how can any preacher continue to resist their attraction, and not defy their familiarity? Dr. Thomas Guthrie, the famous Scottish preacher, told of a young minister whose sermon was dis-

missed with the remark, "Nothing new there!" "Fancy", said Guthrie, "a man to whom I offer a rose fresh plucked from the parterre, dyed in richest hues, breathing the most fragrant odour, with the dewdrops still shining like diamonds on its pure bosom, tossing it from him with an air of contempt, to say, 'Ah! there is nothing new there!' This were not more absurd than that".

This pretty comparison would serve its original purpose; but it gives no hint of what to do when the rose-like text has indeed lost its dewy freshness. How can a legitimate novelty be restored? Before attempting an answer, I would like here to interject a little note. Is it needful always to preface the sermon with a formal announcement of the text? Many a notable preacher has not done so. St. Chrysostom sometimes preached without any text. St. Augustine is said to have preached over 400 sermons without one. Taking a big leap, did Dr. Alexander Whyte always announce the Scripture mottoes attached to his *Bible Characters*? How startling it must have been to hear some of his opening sentences. As, for example, the celebrated one with which he began to speak of Absalom. "Polygamy", he said, "is just Greek for dunghill"—who after hearing that could settle down for a dreary rigmarole? Is not Dr. F. W. Boreham's notable success partly due to his habit of *leading up* to the text before the hearer (*i.e.*, the reader) can divine what it is? It is like the bowler's run up to the wicket before the ball is delivered, and it gives impetus. Much of the power of surprise is lost by sticking to the old convention. Often there would be more impressiveness if the ground were tilled before the familiar seed was broadcast.

This, however, is only an expedient, and we now return to the main topic. Freshness may be found in two directions, and not only one. It may be found by imitating the merchant who went forth seeking goodly pearls. He travels far and wide, and looks for treasures in many realms. Science, art, and literature, history and biography, even the novel and the newspaper, all these may provide the preacher with some fresh contribution. A preacher who was once famous, when asked whether he had any commentaries, replied,

> Every one of my books is a commentary. Histories, the poets, the novels of Thackeray and George Eliot, are all commentaries. I gather fruit from every tree, and pluck flowers in every field.

A man who diligently does this cannot grow stale, and he will make old texts glow with a new significance.

Another way of winning freshness will bring even greater reward. It resembles the work of the gardener who, finding that his top-soil is exhausted, trenches the ground and brings up new soil. The land

called the Bible is one out of whose hills we may dig better treasure than brass if we go deep enough. This method involves a drudgery which will never be seen in the pulpit. It will mean the re-study of familiar texts in their original form and in their native setting. It will mean reaching down to their roots in human life. It will mean hard thinking and penetrating imagination, so that the experience or emotion which brought the words into existence is recaptured and re-lived. One of the most notable exponents of the use of imagination in the pulpit was Dr. Alexander Whyte. How wonderfully he made some old text live again! One example may be given because it is brief. Often have we read the words, "Bow down Thine ear, O Lord, and hear me", and received but little impression. Listen, however, to the old doctor's comment:

> When you are lying, quite prostrate, on your sick-bed; and when you can only whisper your wants, and scarcely that; then your doctor and your nurse bow down their ear to your whispered prayer. And so it is with your sick soul.

Who, having heard that, can ever forget it? The old word has become a new treasure; and it has been done by imagination, by digging down to something like the original experience. And that can be done with many a familiar text. A man may secure freshness by travelling far or by digging deep.

I propose to give one lengthy example. Is there any text more familiar than *Matt.* $11^{28\text{-}30}$? Hundreds of thousands of times has it been preached on; and how can it be presented with any freshness? Not much help can be found in its immediate context. It is agreed that the Evangelist put the passage in an alien setting, though, as Principal A. J. Grieve remarks, it "forms a happy prelude" to the words which follow in $12^{1\text{-}13}$. In Dr. David Smith's Life of our Lord, *The Days of His Flesh* (an unpretentious but valuable book), it is suggested that the words belong to the incident in *John* 7, when on the last day of the Feast Jesus said, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink"; and this seems to be not an unlikely setting.

It will be more to our purpose to observe that the whole passage is poetical in form, being fashioned on the lines of the old Hebrew parallelism. Neither of our English Versions recognizes this, nor do they give a quite accurate translation. Why should we have "laden" in one verse, and "burden" in another verse when it is the same word? Why are we given the word "rest" when in half-a-dozen passages in the *N.T.* the word is translated "refresh"? We need another translation; and, with a few verbal changes, Dr. Moffatt's rendering will meet our need:—

Come unto me, all you that labour and are *burdened,*
And I will *refresh* you.
Take my yoke upon you and learn *from* me,
For I am *gentle* and lowly,
And you shall find refreshment;
For my yoke is *kindly,* and my burden light[1].

To this may be added Dr. David Smith's illuminating comment:

> It is the image of a weary beast, thirsty and galled; and the promise is threefold: a refreshing draught of the living water, a kindly yoke, and a light burden.

The yoke consists of a man's duties, and the burden of his cares. Are not the familiar words beginning to shine with a new lustre?

A leader in the Church of England, speaking at a clerical conference, urged that a new form was needed in which to present the old gospel, and to explain its most familiar terms:

> Take, for example, such a phrase as "*Come to Jesus*!" It would not be a bad idea if we all went home and thought out for ourselves what this phrase means, and then preached a sermon on it. Our congregations do not know what the phrase means, and I am not altogether certain that I know myself.

That is one needful thing; and here is another. The poetical form of the words makes it evident that the phrase, "Come unto Me", is not intended to be regarded as complete in itself. It is linked up with and explained by the parallel: "Take my yoke upon you and learn from me". That is, the coming is meant to lead to the taking and the learning, and is of no worth unless it does.

The over-working of the word "rest" has wrought great mischief. It has induced many people to suppose that this invitation means, "Come and sit down and do nothing". So we have healthy people protesting that they do not want rest, but thrills. The Greek word *Anapauso* is the very word from which we get the English *pause,* and it denotes a break from labour, and implies the resumption of labour when the man has been refreshed. So it is a thrill that Jesus offers—the thrill of being renewed, replenished.

How finely too do the words recognize the double side of life, and set forth the truth that as the divine gift is a human discovery, so the human discovery is a divine gift.

It is also worthy of notice that Jesus did not promise an easy yoke, but a kindly or good one. Dr. Weymouth prefers the word "good", and he cites *Lam.* 3^{27}, "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth", and then he says,

1 The changes from *R.V.* are italicized. J. A. Robinson, in *The Study of the Gospels,* shows that the whole passage is permeated with Aramaic, hence some of the omissions in the above version.

> The good conveys the idea not so much of easiness to bear, which is the thought in the next clause, as of actual benefit received from bearing it.

Now is it not true that by thus digging into the words with the use of our books, the familiar passage has become new, suggestive? The notable testimony of St. Augustine on the words has been often quoted. Not so familiar is the testimony of John Theodore Merz, the industrial leader of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. It has been told that when at college he was walking out with a fellow student, and the conversation turned on religion which then had no interest for either of the young men. "Suddenly", said Merz years afterwards[2],

> the words arose in my mind, *Come unto me, etc.* Now it seemed to me that if Christ had been just one man among others He would not have said those words; or even if He had said them, people would not have come to Him; or if they had come, He could not have given them rest. And it has seemed to me so ever since. Years ago a very modern young lady essayed what she thought would be the easy task of "drawing" Walter Pater to approve while she made light of Christianity. But he replied to her with the very same text, adding: "Those are words we can never forget".

Can the Christian preacher ever forget them?

[2] G. E. Newsom in *Great Christians*.

BOOKS ALSO RECEIVED.

Four Volumes of Old Testament Stories—*Joseph and his Brothers, Moses, Ruth, David*—written and illustrated in colour-lithography by Maud and Miska Petersham. Dent. 2s. 6d. each.

THOMAS MORE. *English Prayers and Treatise on the Holy Eucharist.* Burns, Oates. 2s.

H. A. IRONSIDE. *Help for the Needy Soul.* Pickering. 1s.

C. T. RAE, M.A., B.D. *Contagious Christianity.* Indep. Press. 2s. & 1s. 6d. "Thoughts on Personal Discipline" selected from a weekly newspaper column, based largely on conversations with individuals.

R. A. EDWARDS. *Is the Church Worth While?* Methuen. 2s. Perhaps it was because we expected so much from the author of *Jack, Jill and God* that we found these radio talks disappointing.

The Christian Handbook of S. Africa. Lovedale & World Dominion Presses. 4s. An indispensable book of reference for all dealing with Christian work in S. Africa.

Keswick Convention Report 1938. Pickering. 2s. 6d. & 4s.

J. P. ARENDSEN. *Faith and Common Sense.* Burns, Oates. 6s. Meditations for Sundays and Holydays.

JOHN KEARNEY. *You shall find rest.* Burns, Oates. 6s. Material for Meditations on the Spiritual Life.

New issues in the "Lives for Children" series (Burns, Oates, 1s. each) are *St. Francis of Assisi, St. Paul* and *Little St. Agnes.*

Those who want to venture into unfamiliar fields for books for young people and children should look at Burns, Oates productions: they need not fear Romanist propaganda. Miss Eileen Marsh's *The Hidden Valley* (3s. 6d.) will thrill adventurous readers, though Miss Marsh must not talk of hills being "impassible". R. G. McGregor's *The Dragon and the Mosquito* (2s. 6d.) contains five short stories. Guy Lawrence's *Tob and his Dog* (3s. 6d.) will please lovers of boys and of dogs. Adventure stories for boys are Mr. Hugh Chichester's *The Mystery Man in the Tower* and Mr. D. V. Duff's *Half Deck of the Bradstock* (3s. 6d. each).

Another volume of "saints" comes from Miss Vera Barclay, this time *Saints and Adventures* (Burns, Oates, 2s. 6d.), which differs from the others in having a *Nihil Obstat.*

W. H. ELLIOTT. *"As I was Saying".* Nicholson & Watson, 2s. 6d. Articles reprinted from the *Sunday Pictorial* and the *Sunday Graphic.*

I was in Prison. S.C.M. 1s. Letters from Imprisoned German Pastors printed for private circulation in Germany now translated into English.

STEPHEN KING-HALL and LADY WILLIAMS. *Defence—What Can I do?* Murray. 1s. A hand-book.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

IS THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN AMERICA ON THE ROAD TO SURVIVAL OR TO EXTINCTION?

By Willard Brown Thorp, D.D., Palo Alto, California.

The expression "re-thinking Congregationalism" leads me to remark that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as Congregationalism. We shall search in vain for any "ism" that is distinctive of Congregational churches. Perhaps this very fact is their distinction. But there certainly are Congregational churches in the United States, definite and concrete organizations that have been acting together for a long time. Of these we can speak, and may hope to reach some measure of agreement. We are not concerned with what they were in 1620 or 1720 or 1820. We are concerned with them as they are in the 20th century. The particular question I am raising is whether this body of churches is going up or going down, whether it has the mark of life or of death upon it.

Let us take a bird's-eye view of some of the figures, covering roughly the past forty years.

The number of churches listed was slowly increasing from 1901 to 1915, when it reached its high point—6,103. Then it fell till 1930, when it was 5,381, about the same number as in 1894. The Christian denomination then joined us, bringing our figure up to a new "high" of 6,434; but the combined figure continued to decline until in 1937 it stood at 6,109.

The figures of membership make a somewhat better showing. In 1900 the total membership was 633,000. It increased at the rate of about 10,000 a year until 1930, when it reached 943,000. The Christian accession in that year brought the total to a little over a million members, at which point it has been stationary since.

Figures of Sunday School enrolment, generally less reliable, have fluctuated from year to year, but in the main kept going up until 1925, when they almost reached 800,000. Then they began to fall, and even the reinforcements of the Christians failed to stop the decline, which in 1937 reached 650,000, the lowest point since 1893.

Contributions for denominational benevolences in 1910 stood at $1,270,000, with a little over five-sixths of the churches contributing. The figure did not get above that until 1916, when it began to rise, made a clean jump of a million in 1920, and stayed in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000 until 1930. Then it dropped sharply with the Depression until in 1937 it was about $1,500,000, or back to where it was in 1919.

Another measure of the vitality of a denomination is the amount the churches raise for their local expenses. In 1900 the figure was $7,500,000. It rose steadily until in 1928 it reached $21,713,328. Then it fell until at the bottom of the Depression it was down to $13,300,000. In 1937 it was $14,500,000. This indicates interest and ability in the great body of our stronger churches to maintain their parish activities.

When we come to estimate the spiritual and religious condition of a body of churches figures cannot tell us very much, but such as they are let us look at them. Here is the tale of additions on "profession". In 1890 it was 27,000. With some fluctuations it advanced to 45,800 in 1921. It stayed about that level till 1925, when it began to decline and by 1937 was down on the 33,000 level.

But here is another story. Removals by revision of the roll, which in 1898 were 12,000, began to run up into large figures. By 1910 they were in the twenty thousands. In 1919 they touched 30,000, then fluctuated a little but kept in that neighbourhood and went higher—37,000 in 1931 and 1932. In the past 40 years 974,447 names have been removed from the rolls of the Congregational churches. In other words, in these 40 years, while about a million and a half have been received on profession, about a million have been removed from the rolls. These figures are rather startling. After all due allowance has been made for the various human factors that enter into the falling away of church members, the fact remains that our turn-over has been appalling. The lapses have often outnumbered the new business. A life insurance company which found that to be the case would know that the handwriting was on the wall. We cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that large numbers of people, often very fine people too, who once were warmly interested in some Congregational church, are now no longer interested in any church. The Church lost its charm for them. Some of them lost their religious faith entirely. Some of them moved into localities where there was no church of a type with which they could affiliate. Some of them were drawn into one or another of the cults of mental

healing. It is a significant fact that in many of our large cities in the North and West the Christian Science churches greatly outnumber our own, and they are all full of people. This is certainly the case here in California. In the entering class at our own Pomona College this fall, while Congregationalists were still first and Episcopalians second, Christian Science students stood third, with other denominations trailing. Many of our losses have been among the intelligentsia, a fact of which every university faculty furnishes abundant evidence. Some of the other denominations have had similar experiences, which should not comfort us over much but rather indicate that ours is part of a still larger problem.

I shall refer to this again in another connexion, but let me now point out two things in our denominational history in which we justly take pride. One is our record in the matter of founding institutions of higher learning. Indeed, this has been the characteristic contribution of our churches to America. We can point to no less than 37 fine colleges now in existence, all of which were started in large measure by Congregationalists. This is our roll of honour. The era of the founding of Christian colleges, however, virtually ended with the 19th century. All but a few of these institutions which once we could claim as ours are now on an independent basis. And the same thing is largely true of our other great enterprise, foreign missions. The American Board is the dean of all the church missionary societies in this country. Here too the outstanding work has been in the field of education, and here too many of the colleges started by us in various parts of the world have cast off the leading strings and now make their appeal to the general public. The missionary movement so far as we are concerned has passed its climax. The number of missionaries maintained by our Board in 1920 was 724 and the budget of the Board was $2,000,000. To-day the number of missionaries is 429 and the budget $1,100,000.

The impression left upon the mind by what has thus far been said is certainly not that of a vigorous and growing organism. To this must be added one fact which is generally recognized, although figures for it are not readily available. As a denomination we have not in recent years been reproducing our own ministry, but have obtained our pastors to a large extent from men, trained in other denominations, especially the Presbyterian and the Methodist, who have been glad to get into the atmosphere of freedom and breadth and intelligence that prevails in Congregational churches. There has also been a large and unmeasurable exodus from our ministry into business, social service, and education on the part of men who either found themselves misfits in the pastorate or were convinced that they could better themselves elsewhere in the way of opportunity and emolument. There has been an increasing number of young men emerging from colleges who have felt that the average church,

even in as liberal a denomination as ours, did not present an adequate scope for their abilities and their professional development.

Now let us turn to ask a question that goes to the heart of the whole matter: what is the character and strength of the religious interest in the typical Congregational church of to-day?

Elbert Hubbard once made the remark that churches for the most part were not religious but social organizations. The saying gave me a twinge of pain: it came altogether too close to the truth to be comfortable. A church is supposed to be primarily a religious institution. It is built around that idea. But it would be a mistake to suppose that a Congregational church to-day is a body of deeply religious people. There are in it many who are quite uncertain what their religious convictions are. They regard themselves as Christians, liberal Christians, but in a rather general way. About all one can be sure of when a person allies himself with one of our churches is that he likes to be associated with the sort of people that are found there. He believes in the value of maintaining such a church as an institution in the community. He feels a pride in seeing that it is supported properly and is in general a credit to those who belong to it. He likes to have it keep up its end in what are vaguely known as the "benevolences" of the denomination to which it belongs. He is particularly pleased when they have a minister who draws large congregations and is popular with young people. He likes to join in singing familiar hymns of an undogmatic type. He is glad to have the minister "preach the gospel" with enthusiasm and earnestness. He and others in the congregation are quite willing that the minister should believe a good deal more than they do; but they are restive when he shows signs of being an extremist in any direction, and particularly of being addicted to social theories which they regard as subversive.

It need hardly be said that a person can be animated by all these convictions without being a religious person at all. And it would be said in some quarters that the chief trouble with the Congregational churches to-day is that these are the people who mostly compose it, and that this is what keeps it from being to any marked degree a religious force. Its clergy get together in conventions and pass all manner of resolutions as to the convictions they stand for. But the clergy are one thing and the laymen of the churches who pay the bills and make the churches go are quite another thing. The resolutions that are passed in conventions of ministers often would not get very far in their own parishes.

There is no doubt considerable truth in what has just been said. It is certainly the case that many people in our congregations have been drawn together because they like the sound of religion rather than because they themselves are practising it in their daily lives. One has a clear impression that the practice of prayer, or its equiva-

lent in spiritual affirmation and self-examination, figures less than it used to in the life of the people who compose our churches. Certainly the number of those who can be called upon to lead in prayer is quite small. And probably a good many people want a religious man to be their preacher but are not desirous of being religious themselves to any marked degree. In fact, it sometimes happens that individuals who are strongly given to personal religion find themselves rather lonesome in one of our churches and are regarded as a little peculiar. These are things that are matters of common observation. They can be explained and to some extent rationalized. But they are not things one would point to as evidence that an organization is a vigorous religious force.

As a matter of fact these things to which we have been referring are simply aspects of a larger problem which always confronts a religious society, namely its relation to the secular world around it. Something like what we are now experiencing has been of necessity the case in every type of church throughout Christian history. The only exception is in the early stages of a religious movement, when all the people in it are filled with the same spirit and practising the same religious discipline. This is the reason why the new religious cults of to-day bear a rather striking resemblance to the primitive Christians. But they too are finding that they consist of a religious core with a surrounding constituency of more or less casual adherents. The Roman Catholic Church has always recognized two distinct elements, the ordinary communicants and the "religious", the deeply consecrated element which is mostly found in the religious orders. Among Protestants the same distinction exists in a less formal way. The important thing is that the religious interest shall remain central and shall not be outnumbered or outweighed by its more or less secular surroundings. This must ever be the concern of the pastor and the group of spiritual workers who are his main stay.

There is a saying to the effect that the minister should regard his church as his force rather than his field. But every pastor soon finds that his church, while in some measure his force, is in a larger measure his field. There are a few cases in which he can "say to this man go and he goeth". The personnel of this group of devoted spiritual helpers will vary from time to time. But the people who compose his church constituency are far from being all of that type: it is too much to expect. Many of them are connected with the institution by much looser ties—in the choir, the church school, the young people's groups, and the various auxiliary societies. Through these many families and individuals are brought more or less casually into contact with the organization and even into its membership. This is the minister's "field", and he is thankful for all of it. Any attempt to impose a strict religious regimentation would result in alienating persons whom he is seeking to reach and influence. It is conditions

like these that often give to a superficial observer the impression that the church is nothing but a social organization, which is far from being the case.

What has just been said brings up a subject that needs careful consideration. It is the question of the relation of the professional ministry to the denomination, and of a certain lag that has long been felt between clergy and laity. The active element in our denomination to-day is, and has been as far back as my memory goes, predominantly clerical. In spite of the effort to get laymen into our conferences, the voices heard there are largely those of ministers. With the exception of a few experienced and energetic men and women who are members of our Boards, the laymen are occasional visitors, while the ministers are always there. They know the ropes, dominate the committees, and handle the machinery. In fact the ministers are apt to get the impression that they are the Church, and even that the real *raison d'être* of the Church is to provide parishes and salaries for ministers.

And in an important sense it is true that the ministers are the Church. They may be said to have created it. In almost every instance churches have been gathered by the activity of energetic ministers. Some minister, who may have been a denominational official, was usually the prime mover in the formation of a local church. In the history of every local church are certain strong pastorates that stand out. Men and women gathered about those able ministers, subscribed their salaries, and held up their hands. After the strong pastor came others who availed themselves of the momentum he had created, and then came some in whose hands the work languished until another strong pastor appeared. Some were strong as preachers and some as organizers and winners of men.

Someone was heard to say among us not long ago that perhaps a church could get along better without a minister, just as a co-operative society of Christian men and women. The Christian Science churches seem to be flourishing without a ministry. But to say that would be to know that it simply would not work at all among us, except with a very unusual body of people. The genius of Protestantism calls for those educated and trained specialists in religion and in parish leadership who are known as ministers, just as the genius of Catholicism calls for the parish priest and the bishop. That explains why our conventions are so largely clerical. At a medical convention or a legal convention the general lay public may be admitted to the galleries, but it is the professionals who occupy the floor and take the platform. They consult together over their professional problems and policies, and then they go home to their private practice. The analogy is far from perfect, but it is at least suggestive, and it helps to explain and justify the relative position of clergy and laity in most churches.

No, as ministers we cannot evade the responsibility of leadership. And we cannot "pass the buck" to the laity and expect them to tell us how to do it. Each one of our churches is largely what the pastor makes it. He cannot make bricks without straw. He cannot build up a Congregational church out of people that do not naturally gather around such a church. But a really strong man, a man of faith and persistence and friendliness and organizing ability will often gather a church in the most unpromising places.

The ministry in large measure has made the Church, and the future of our churches is in the hands of their ministry. If Congregationalism in America is losing ground, it is because men of sufficient strength and zeal have not been coming into its ministry and staying by it. If the churches are losing their faith and their consecration and their concern about religion; if they are tending to become social rather than religious organizations; if when their people come together they talk about almost anything rather than religion, I fear it means that the ministers themselves have become somewhat likeminded. When I look over my people and lament their worldliness and their lack of attention to personal religion there comes upon me that most humbling of all thoughts for a minister—"Like people, like priest". If I have serious doubts, as I do, about the future of our beloved denomination it is because as I look over our ministry I see too few men upon whom the mantle of Elijah has fallen.

THE SOUTH INDIA RAPPROCHEMENT.[1]

By V. Chakkarai, *Madras.*

Some good friend, obviously of Pasumalai, one of the foes of the Church Union Scheme, has been pleased to forward to me the Rev. Charles Clayton Morrison's article under the above caption in *Christendom*. The able writer says that it was written in response to a request for an expression of opinion "on the proposals of the S.I.U.C., adopted last October (1937)". Those who have republished it believe that it "will be of immense value to those who are concerned and interested in the South India Scheme". And as Dr. Morrison's essay blesses in entirety, or almost so, the South India Scheme, the Pasumalai gentlemen have in turn blessed it in entirety. I want to examine Dr. Morrison's theory of the Church as well as his criticisms of the proposals of the General Assembly for intercommunion and intercelebration before union.

With the views on the Church put forward I am familiar, though not friendly. They are those of certain Anglican theologians who

1 This article is printed by the courtesy of the Editor of the *Guardian* of Madras. Too little has been heard of the views of Indians in the discussions of the Church Union Scheme, and therefore we place this contribution before our readers.—Editor.

would support the Roman Catholic ecclesiasticism minus the head, the Pope, and infallibility. The Roman Catholic doctrine has at least the great merit of logic and consistency but this is a truncated system. What is this view of the Church? The Church is the Body of Christ; the Church is the community—the doing of God; it is not a voluntary association of men who hold certain views in common and adopt certain rites; the Church is "the bearer of salvation"; in the Church is "the revelation of God not the revelation of a doctrine about God, but of God Himself; Christianity is not a doctrine, not a way of life, not a personal religious experience; Christianity is a specific and concrete community. This Church is the carrier of his grace". Here is a sparkling gem that I believe Bishop Gore or some one of that school discovered in the diamond mines of Patristic literature. "As God was in Christ so he was (is now) in the Church—the Church was the extension and effectuation of the incarnation. Moreover, to affirm that God was in 'Christ' was to affirm that God was in the Body of Christ, which is the Church. Paul declared the wonderful evangel 'God was in Christ reconciling the world into himself'. Manifestly this statement of the Apostle could not have referred to the limited person of the historical Jesus, but to the community of the faith of which Christ was the Head. It was not Jesus as a detached individual who reconciled the world to God; it was what God did through him. And what did God do through him? He created a community in his company. . . . . To be a true member of the Church was to be 'in Christ'. To be in Christ was to be a member of the Church. The concepts are absolutely interchangeable". Again, "the creeds did not create the church. The church created them". Such are some of the statements that Dr. Morrison thinks will help Indian Christians not only to solve the knotty questions of Church Union, but to know the Lord and be known of Him.

I think it was Josiah Royce of America who in *The Problem of Christianity* did away with the historical Jesus and the risen Lord and made loyalty to the community the real thing in Christianity. His theory was the *Church Minus Jesus Christ*. Dr. Morrison's is a subtle variant of the same, *No Christ without the Church*. In both cases the Church is exalted—the creature over the creator. Some modernists have a charming theory that somehow the Church created Christ out of nothing, or almost the same thing, out of a historical figure called Jesus who was by no means a remarkable person. In discussing the creeds that are the creations of the Church, Dr. Morrison is careful to say that they are intellectual formulations of the experience of the Church, experience whose origin is the Lord. But the two, the Lord's grace and man's ideology, according to him, may be distinguished but cannot be divorced. That is, man's philosophy is indispensable to God's grace and truth. The vast subjective

fallacy of this I shall not pause to point out at length, but leave it with my emphatic protest.

It is curious how European philosophy has affected Christian concepts. The idea that the Church is an extension of the incarnation is simply Hegelianism transferred to the Church. The Absolute incarnates in man's reason, and this reason attains its highest in the State; ergo, the State is super-human, and Herr Hitler is the superman, or demi-god. The Lord Himself is incarnated in the State fully; no; but He is incarnated or reincarnated in the Church. This is quite flattering to the State, Herr Hitler, the Church, and Churchmen. But it seems to be mere communal egoism, in the garb of the Lord's seamless robe that the Roman soldiers stole. It is the creation of an ecclesiastical personality that is a mere hallucination, that history repudiates and good sense rejects. I shall say here a few words why this whole baseless fabric has no attraction for me nor any meaning.

(1) To the Indian, be he a Hindu, Christian, or Mussalman, God is the supreme or only reality. Nothing else is coordinate with Him, or indispensable to His perfection or plenitude. Dr. Morrison's theory of the Church does violence to this fundamental—the Indian view of God.

(2) The Church in history (especially of western Christendom) is not an extension of the incarnation. Probably the Indian would regard this as blasphemy. The fact that individuals in the Church or Churches, either singly or in groups, have been saved and directed by the Lord cannot make them an extension of the incarnation. The history of the Church, its past melancholy and marred record at which the western sceptic Gibbon levelled his polished irony, and its present impotence in face of the world wickedness and fraud of its rulers, are an extension of the Holy One's incarnation! God forbid.

(3) In India we are not prepared to identify Christianity with the Church, or rather to identify the Church with Christ. The separation has been made in the Indian consciousness. It knows Him apart from the Church, Western or Eastern, and apart from civilization, in which the Church lives, breathes and has its being. The western Church or churches (why should Dr. Morrison speak of the Church? There is no such thing as the Church, except as a metaphor) I do not condemn. They have been the nurseries of great *bhaktas* and great movements. But to equalize the Church with the Blessed One—that is beyond my capacity.

(4) To say that the Church is the carrier of salvation, what does it mean? If it means that it preaches the Word, or rather ought to preach it, it is no doubt true; though the Church cannot claim that its preaching of the Word is God's Word. Dr. Morrison knows that

Karl Barth will hotly reject his theory as the *Babel Tower*, or *Titanism*. But if it means that in some sense the church saves or rather the Lord can only save through the Church, I refuse to accept such a pretentious creed. The Lord saves and has saved apart from the churches, so far as human wisdom can discern. Such a boast is dangerous because of its obvious tendency to inflate churchmen and inspire them with a narrowness that will squeeze out its true Christian attitude. In India we must evolve a conception of the Church that it is also the Church of Esau before it can be the Church of Jacob.

4. The Churches cannot lay the flattering unction to their souls (if they have any) that the Lord will always be with them or in them, irrespective of their conformity to His will. The old Church of Israel thought that Jerusalem would be inviolate and Jehovah would not desert it. But the prophet Ezekiel told them in crushing language that it was false security. The splendour of the Lord departed. Not seldom the same happened with the Church or churches. The Lord left their house desolate, though a remnant did not bow the knees to Baal. The Church or churches have no claim for independence; some or all of them the Lord can and may cause to disappear, as has often happened in the past. These are earthen vessels that may be broken when their use has been fulfilled or their abuse has frustrated their purpose.

(5) The conception of St. Paul—that Churches are the Body of Christ—has been done to death in the hands of ecclesiastical lawyers. A metaphor has been metamorphosed into a juristic institution till we can no longer recognize in its modern meaning or medieval the lofty ideal of the original author. The Roman Church, pressing the figure of speech to its furthest extent, not only makes the Church the extension of the incarnation, but makes its earthly head the real head of the Church, for without a visible head the visible Church is a trunk without head. The analogy is complete. All that St. Paul, borrowing probably the figure from Stoicism, meant was that Christians should carry out the will of the Lord.

(6) Our Lord never made use of this figure of the Church being His Body. This figure could not have emanated from Him; for there was a more congenial one, consecrated by the usage of the prophets, viz., that He is the vine and Christians are branches; and according to the Fourth Evangelist, He made use of this to enforce the lesson of abiding in Him with the dreadful possibility of the contrary followed by destruction. My contention is that Western theology and ecclesiasticism have changed the flexibility and freedom of Biblical figures into the rigidity of dogmatic moulds. The function of the more poetic mind of the east is to soften the angularities and lubricate the joints made stiff by exclusive pretensions. This is not the place where I can elaborate what the Indian view of the Church

will be, even if it be possible to do so without running the risk of turning out a false prophet (by the way, Paul's figure of the olive tree in *Romans* is more appropriate).

7. With regard to the creeds, Dr. Morrison wants that they should be regarded *as ancient witnesses* of some truths. So far as the creeds are concerned, Indian Christians, even the majority (90 or 95 per cent and even more) are not troubled about the creeds being witnesses, ancient or modern. In the S.I.U.C., and even in the so-called Anglican churches, even the pastors have not the dimmest idea of the controversies that led to the Nicene formula. Nor of the debased ideology of neo-platonism that underlies its phraseology. Indian theology is yet to be realized. Those who are acquainted with the theology of the Nicene creed have no need for it, and it is an antiquated one that can be of no value apart from its being a relic of ancient paganism. My complaint is not about its theological inadequacy and falsity but its failure to bring to man's minds the mind and will and grace of the Lord and His Kingdom—which is not the Church.

Now something more has to be said about intercelebration and intercommunion, which the S.I.U.C. would demand before a further move can be made in the direction of Church Unity. I shall state my position as follows :—

(1) Dr. Morrison has evidently no conception of the Indian Christian situation. Otherwise, he would not have misread it so completely.

(2) The South Indian Scheme had no Indian origin. It was an importation from Lambeth : hence all the many twistings and contortions and distortions of the last twenty years are sought to be fitted into the Procrustean bed of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The Indian mind has contributed nothing to it but opposition. If I may say so, the presence of Anglican Bishops and western missionaries on the Joint-Committee has deflected the Indian mind into channels that are not its own.

(3) The Mission field is not a fit scene where to fight out the battles of western ecclesiasticism. They ought to be transferred to Rome, Canterbury, or Geneva which is their native habitat. Strange that they should try to impose a western solution of western controversies in the eastern mind. It is our tragedy, that such experiments should be made on our quivering flesh !

(4) These sectarianisms mean little or nothing to us. And if western missionaries were to disappear miraculously from India, after twenty years not a vestige of these will survive to tell the tale of the tiresome negotiations of the unionists. They are accentuating them among Indian Christians to emphasize the importance of removing them by the Quadrilateral.

(5) So far as I am concerned, I have never felt the slightest desire to inter-commune with members of the Anglican or other churches. I do not see any such tremendous power and holiness in them that this Holy Communion should inspire me. Why then does the S.I.U.C. insist upon intercommunion and intercelebration? It is, I believe, the desire to show that unity exists among Indian Christians, and it should be recognized outwardly in this manner. The scheme is only the ring, but not of the essence of the union. If Christian love does not exist, then even the Lambeth Quadrilateral cannot evoke it. That is the case in the west: Roman Catholic unity of church policy and loyalty has not yet made the German Catholics and French Catholics love one another in the Lord. That their so-called unity can alter the essence of human relations, is a mere delusion and a snare.

(6) Dr. Morrison speaks of the unfairness of demanding them before union. The two church bodies, at least, these officials, are now bargaining and have been doing so, like parents of a bride and bridegroom, for the biggest amounts of cash dowry. I may be accused of want of charity if I say that these negotiations have also had a very melancholy aspect to me. And if Dr. Morrison calls the new proposals earnest money, he is welcome to do so. If intercommunion and intercelebration can only have a place when unity exists, then two alternative inferences can be drawn. Either we believe that unity exists (that is my position); then intercommunion and intercelebration are mere matters of courtesy. If unity does not exist, it must be sought in the higher sphere of the Lord's mind in which case intercommunion and intercelebration may be tokens that parties stand on an equal footing and are ready to venture on the voyage of faith.

I regret that so much time, talents, and even finance should be squandered on this scheme. If it is effectuated it will not be followed by Indians rushing to enter the united Church with its bishops, mitres and apostolic origin from that fisherman of Galilee. In India our Saivaite *Matathipathis* trace their apostolic descent from Mount *Kailash,* from *Nandi,* and the western analogue will not startle Indians into awe and admiration. If it is not effected, as it would seem, nothing of great consequence is lost. India will find a solution, if such be necessary. Why art thou troubled and disquiet thy soul in vain? Hope thou in God, for He is the health of thy countenance and joy.

THE CINEMA AND THE ADOLESCENT.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH.

By Doris Odlum, M.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.P.M.

Let us consider what we mean by psychology; it deals with the emotional re-action of a human being to environment, or to inner

stresses, or inner influences; and it is for us to decide how far these emotional effects may be controlled or organized, or how far they are completely out of hand in regard to the child or the adolescent who visits the cinema.

I am merely talking platitudes when I say that we all require a certain amount of emotional escape. We all require a certain amount of day-dreaming, and of phantasy, in order to be able to get to grips with reality. We know that the tiny child plays out all its experiences, and by that method, by introducing them into its play, and by identifying itself with these situations, it comes to grips with them; it exteriorizes them; and ultimately is able to view them with a certain amount of emotional detachment. Now even adults, and certainly adolescents, require a great deal of what corresponds to this childish play; and any kind of entertainment, such as the cinema, or theatre, and even books, supplies this need. The cinema, of course, is a new method which has only developed in our own time. But we have to remember that we have always, or at least for a great many years, had the outlet of the book, and, to a lesser extent, the theatre; and we must realize that it is not new, in kind, for a child, or an adolescent, to have the means of emotional escape of this sort; the only thing is that it has become more vivid. It is rather interesting to realize, however, that no film has ever had the emotional power that certain books have had; it may be because the films that have been shown have not been powerful enough to produce that effect. I have discussed with children and adolescents their emotional re-action to films and plays; and they have all said to me that you get far deeper and more lasting emotional effects from a book, because you read a book at your leisure; you can read into the book what you want to, and you get out of the book what you want to, whereas the film presents a situation too definitely for you to read very much of your own emotional background into it. That is an interesting point of view. It does not mean, of course, that the cinema does not have a very great psychological effect. These young people admit it; and I am sure we all realize that it does. But it is worth considering that the books that children read appear to be much more important in their psychological effect.

In regard to the adolescent, we have to be very careful to recognize that adolescence in our northern climate is a slow, prolonged process; adolescence we may regard as occupying the years from twelve to twenty; and the emotional re-actions of the first four years, from twelve to sixteen, are entirely different from the emotional re-actions of the last four, from sixteen to twenty. From the ages of twelve to sixteen the average adolescent is really much more a child than an adult; and during the ages from sixteen to twenty, much more an adult than a child, and its whole set of values, and its whole interests, undergo extreme change. After the age of sixteen the child is living

a very different sort of life from the early years of adolescence; he is having, for the first time, to face existence as a really independent being. Now the great problem that the adolescent in these later years has to face is getting to grips with his environment; but he has not any standard of values, or any background upon which he can draw, to show him how to cope with this new problem. The influence of the film may be very important from that point of view. He sees situations presented in films, sees different types of people behaving in very different ways from those that he actually comes across. He sees problems of behaviour that he has not actually met with in daily life, though he may meet with them later on. I am thinking particularly, of course, of the emotional situations in relation to love, or sex questions. Children of seventeen to eighteen have not had very much experience of that kind of thing in their own lives; and when they first meet it they are completely at sea; they have had very little guidance as a rule from anybody on this subject. The child who has had the opportunity of seeing a well worked-out film has learned how that situation is tackled; sometimes it is tackled well, and sometimes badly. But the child who has seen the situation tackled well has been given the opportunity of knowing what kind of a situation it may meet, and how that situation may be dealt with. I think that is a great help. Many adolescents have told me that they have realized what a great help it was to them to have the opportunity of meeting, as it were vicariously, these situations. We all realize how strong is the influence and value of what Aristotle described in his *Poetics* as *Catharsis,* the opportunity of exteriorizing one's emotions through somebody else's eyes, because we can then find, to some extent, what our own emotional re-actions are.

Much can be learned about the psychology of adolescents by finding out who are their favourite film stars and which their favourite films; one can learn much about the type of temperament of an adolescent by what he puts in, or by what he gets out of a film, and what are his emotional re-actions. Even in my young days, when there were no films, girls bought photographs of actors—George Alexander, Lewis Waller, and others; and boys from the ages of seventeen to twenty had photographs of leading actresses. To-day we have got the exact replica, only now it is not the actors but the film stars. There is considerable evidence that adolescents go to see their favourites rather than the films themselves.

The chief damage that the films are doing to the adolescent to-day is an indirect one. I do not think it is the films that are so dangerous; I believe it is the publications about films and film stars that are doing such a lot of damage; the girls simply devour these cheap weeklies about the lives of film stars, and the way they go on at Hollywood, and the awful jargon they are supposed to talk—I

think quite wrongly. One sees girl after girl using her leisure, and a large proportion of her spare money, in buying and reading these wretched little papers. They spend much of their time in making up like Greta Garbo, or some other film star. There is no question that the young women of to-day dress better than they did in our youth; that is a very good thing; but it is also a great danger if they should get it into their heads that all that really matters in life is glamour. There is a very strong tendency, especially among the less educated girls—it is not so noticeable in the High Schools as in the Elementary Schools—to be overwhelmed by this sense of glamour. The background of their lives is drab, and it is natural that they should get swept off their feet by the glamorous picture they get of the life of the film stars. We are all apt to over-estimate our own capacities, and we imagine that we can be Greta Garbo's if we get the chance, and that it is only an unkind destiny that prevents us from being so. Adolescents must be made to realize that there is only one way to get to the top of the tree, and that is by stability of character, and real hard work. They tend to think it can be done by glamour, and by a sort of get-rich-quick method. There, in the whole atmosphere that surrounds the film world, is where the danger is to be found rather than in the individual film. Of course, it is essential that we should work for the improvement of every individual film. But I think the Christian Cinema Council should give its attention to this question of the film weeklies, and should try to find out whether it is possible to exert any influence on the publication of these glamorous and unhealthy, and often untrue, so-called details of the lives and manners of film stars. The films have come to stay; and the film star weeklies have also come to stay; but we can, I am sure, do something to modify their tone, and try to keep away from the children these ideas of false glamour and glitter, and meretricious beauty, and so on. It must be the object of all of us to try to give to the adolescent something worth while to replace this. It is no good taking away anything if we do not give something in return. Questionnaires have shown that children do not want to go to the cinema as a sort of school in disguise; some of them try to get to see the film that they are forbidden to see, just because that adds to the fun. What we want to do is not merely to restrict but also to offer a constructive and acceptable emotional alternative.

MISSIONS AND THE FUTURE.

By Gertrude R. James.

I should like to discuss the article on "Missions and the Future", by the Rev. William Paton in the July issue, with particular reference

to Madagascar, the small corner of the world where I live. Mr. Paton says:

> It is easy to think of the Indian or the Chinese Christians merely as great numbers of additional workers whose aid in carrying out the task of world evangelization can be counted on to an extent that was not possible to an earlier generation. The indigenous churches are in one sense, of course, the core of all policy, but it seems as though they are to be raised up and made strong, vigorous, and self-supporting in order that the total task may be better and more rapidly accomplished. But this is to forget that they are living Churches. If they are living Churches then we must beware, as we beware the Devil, lest we treat them as tools and forget that they are responsible to the living God and not to us.

The success of Missions in Madagascar is referred to as phenomenal. I have often read visitors' accounts of the mass meetings in the Capital and elsewhere, in extravagant language, as if they were something little short of the miraculous. The huge numbers of native workers, both lay and ordained, appear to surpass many other fields and indicate extraordinary progress in so far as statistics can be trusted as any kind of indication or estimate of spiritual work. So strong is this general impression of prosperity, both financial and spiritual, in some of the churches in England which take interest in missionary work that one would feel that one had strayed into the wrong street, if one had any other comment to make other than one in accord with the story of progress and numbers. Yet many who think a little further, and on reasoning lines, ask if it is not yet time for the missionaries to withdraw from Madagascar, and leave the evangelization of the heathen tribes to the Hova, who have received so much—particularly from the L.M.S.—and set free men and women and money for work in less advanced fields.

In books referring to Madagascar and particularly to the L.M.S. work amongst the Hova tribe, whose home is in Tananarive and the Imerina Province, reference is also frequently made to the fact that the Hova, being a great trader, is often to be found established in commerce or planting in every part of the Island. The dominating power of the Hova before the French Occupation aided and fostered that commercial tendency; but although spending his life away from home the Hova holds to the land of his fathers with great tenacity: and there his body must be buried, even if a temporary burial for some years has to be effected in whatever corner of the Island he has lived.

Mention is often made also, generally with great approbation, of the fact that the Christian Hova must always have his own little church wherever he goes, the deduction being that this makes the

Hova a missionary, spreading the word of God at the same time as he actively engages in commerce.

This deduction is a definitely wrong one to make, for whatever may be said of an occasional individual or of a particular group, the Hova as a Church is not missionary-minded.

In the area on the plateau in which my husband is stationed, we are called the Betsileo Mission; but many of our ministrations as a Mission are to Hova people living in Betsileo, who not infrequently resent the missionary spending too big a proportion of his time amongst the country Betsileo. In the reign of the Queen, following the great persecution when Christianity was made the State Religion, the Betsileo were driven to church. As slaves they built the church they attended. On Monday morning the Hova Governor of the village fined those who were absent from church on Sunday. The coming of the French freed them from slavery and incidentally from church attendance. Many Betsileo still shut their doors to Jesus Christ because they believe that He is the Hova God, and they will have nothing to do with the religion of the tribe that enslaved them long years ago. The Betsileo Church has yet to be built.

At the present I am in the Forest, while my husband visits the few churches already established among the Tanala, and attempts to establish others. Last week (at the same time that I read Mr. Paton's article) I went with him to visit two of those churches, both nearly 20 kms. away from the centre here. The first was to a church in the middle of a well-populated Tanala village. The people crowded into the church, and a service was held. Because they wished to hear my voice too, I told them a Bible story. My husband held a baptismal service also, and preached to those people who had left their work for the day because they knew he was coming. He inspected a school building that is nearly finished, arranged about the necessary Government application to be made, sold bibles, testaments, hymn-books, *etc.*, talked to the men of the church about various church matters, and altogether spent an utterly satisfactory day. They were all Tanala and a very happy crowd, with the babies tumbling over their mothers on the floor. They brought us presents, made us excellent coffee, and gave us a meal of the usual rice and fowl.

I thoroughly enjoyed the day, and three days later went in another direction expecting much the same kind of experience.

Here, however, we were met by a small group of Hova men and women, who escorted us to their church—a much smaller church in a definitely larger Tanala village—a building with a significant fence all around it. The little group of Hova were well-dressed and they were very pleased indeed to see us, graciously welcoming us, and especially delighted to see the missionary's wife. The service began, and I inwardly noted the difference in the sermon my husband

preached, which was one definitely planned for people who had known the Bible and the Christian religion from their birth. I noticed three Tanala girls, more bold than their comrades, push their way into the building, and the Hova ladies definitely drew their silk "lamba" more closely around them : but there outside the fence were the Tanala, crowds of them passing to and fro, the more curious looking over the fence to see what was going on inside ; so near that in the tropical heat one could feel and smell the very closeness of them ; and yet so far because of the fence that lay between : for that fence was the outward sign of the great spiritual barrier that lay between those inside and the crowd that wandered without.

When the service was over the Hova planters scattered to their homes, many of them living several kms. away from the central village. We were entertained by one of them. As a visit it was most interesting—coffee in all its stages of growth and drying processes surrounded us. The outhouses of his 15 Tanala workmen were close to his own house. There was a good harmonium, some solid furniture, and pleasing evidences of a refined home. The head of the house discoursed on past days and previous missionaries, referring of course to the plateau and the period of his youth there ; asking particularly after some of the missionaries' children, now grown up. We had family prayers before leaving, for which they were delighted for me to play their harmonium. They even took a photograph to commemorate my visit to their home. We then said Good-bye, feeling that our visit had been worth while and perhaps of spiritual value to the man, who had, we knew, often strayed from the straight and narrow path.

But on the way home my husband said : "What do you think of the day ?" My answer was given slowly. I said : "As a day out I have thoroughly enjoyed it ; but on Tuesday at our other visit I felt we were preaching the Gospel to the people. To-day I feel that I have worshipped with the aristocracy, and my enjoyment of the day is clouded when I remember those Tanala faces outside the fence".

He did not turn his head, for on the few roads that have been cut in the Forest driving needs no distractions, but he said : "I guessed you would have a comment to make so I never prepared you. That's the problem there and it needs careful handling. When the Hova come in, the Tanala go out ; and the Hova have no interest in the people there in the village. All those Hova people there to-day are in the second and third generation of Christians and know the truth".

I came home and chanced to read Mr. Paton's article, and realized that I had been looking on at an instance of those Christians that "may hold things up, from the point of view of a comprehensive world policy of advance".

The Hova planter or the Hova trader, when a Christian, often desires his little Bethel for himself but is just indifferent to the needs of those around. Even in the larger, older, churches on the plateau, there is no definite hostility to the missionary cause—there is even a Native Missionary Society—but on Malagasy Committees I have heard advanced precisely the same kind of arguments as one hears are pressing in the home Church, that the pastor should be better paid, that the poor and the unemployed should claim attention and so on.

Unless the missionaries themselves are free to lead the way in evangelizing the heathen tribes in Madagascar, the Tanala and their fellow-men will either remain heathen or be annexed by the Jesuits.

In a way that could never have been envisaged in any kind of Mission policy or plan of advance the Hova Christian does and can "hold things up", when he leaves his native province. Statistics and multiplication tables just fail to apply in face of the indifference of many of these Christians, who not only cannot be ignored, but who still need spiritual aid themselves.

It is terribly easy even for us as missionaries to expect and even to demand that those to whom we have preached shall in their turn preach to those who are still further on, in the sense of a spiritual relay race; but in doing that we and the home constituency who work out these indigenous church policies and statistics may find ourselves, as Mr. Paton says, treating them "as tools and forgetting that they are responsible to the living God and not to us".

CHURCHES AND FOOTBALL CLUBS.

By Rev. P. Stanley Eley.

Is a church football club a bane or a blessing? That question has often been put to me. It has come from friends. Sometimes strangers have written me. In both cases the formation of football clubs in their churches was being discussed. My own connexion with football, I assume, made them look upon me as an authority. For over twenty years I was a referee. For some years I served as a football "legislator" on one of the branches of the Football Association. During my residence in Scotland I broadcast many talks on football. Two of my own churches have had football clubs. Whether or not I can claim to speak with authority, it is probable that I have viewed the whole business from an angle unusual to most ministers.

What answer does my accumulated, and possibly unique, experience lead me to give? To begin with, I recall with some unhappiness that when I was "the man with the whistle" I did not discover any marked superiority of good sportsmanship on the part of Church or Sunday School players over those of other clubs.

I have been under the painful necessity of ordering from the field as many churches' club players as those of the others. Their offences included dirty play, foul language, and disputing the referee's decisions. (No doubt, they sometimes felt that they had cause to commit the last-named offence. It happens, however, to be a breach of football laws.)

When I served as a member of the legislative body we dealt with some nasty cases, and I often blushed with shame as I listened to the evidence. Our reputation was let down very badly. There were football players wearing the jerseys of church clubs whose conduct was a disgrace. That statement should not be taken without having due regard to all the facts. Outside the big professional leagues, there are thousands of clubs, and tens of thousands of players, who go through season after season playing perfectly sportsmanlike football. Amongst them are the churches' clubs and players. My experience is that they are no worse than the others, but also that they are no better. I have no exact record, but I am of the opinion that the percentage of offences is as high in the one class of club as the other.

And here I must state a fact which, I am sure, cannot be too strongly emphasized. Many churches make the mistake of running football clubs when they really have not sufficient young men and youths to warrant the enterprise. Let us suppose that a church has twenty such people anxious to play football. They may be excellent young fellows—but "duds" at the game. It does not follow that because a young man is an ideal Christian Endeavourer he is also an ideal footballer. I have in mind a young man of my acquaintance some years ago who was a splendid Sunday School teacher, a magnificent elocutionist, and a most able lay preacher. (He is a minister now.) Also, he was by way of being almost up to county standard as an opening batsman and a fast bowler. But his efforts at football were a huge joke—except to the other members of the side. His character, conduct, personality would have been most valuable on the football field—if he could have played football. He did his best—but unfortunately directly the ball went his way he was a liability, not an asset.

Your young man who reads a thoughtful paper at the Bible Class may be a muddler in the forward-line, and worse than a mess as a half-back. Dare I say, he might prove to be what our Salvationist friends call a "soul-winner" without being a match winner?

However, let us take a church where a football club is formed. Affiliation is secured with the nearest branch of the Football Association. There is a Church or Sunday School League in which the club is entered. The fixtures begin. The first half-a-dozen games result in overwhelming defeats: 8—0, 7—1, 10—0 (I have

seen it happen!). Of course, someone wants to say "The game's the thing; not the winning of it". Excellent philosophy indeed. But I defy anybody to be always on the losing side—the crushed and pulverized side—without also losing enthusiasm. (Don't forget the dear girl friends of the players in that church. They are making their caustic comments. "Was it another cricket score yesterday, Jack?") The team is chopped and changed about. Some of its best members, from the church's standpoint, are dropped. The changes bring no improvement. Then, one of two things will almost inevitably happen. Perhaps this: the club disbands half-way through the season. That is not the end of the affair. Because it has failed to fulfil its fixtures, the club and its officials and players are placed under suspension by the Football Association. I know a church secretary who is debarred from taking any part in football because some years ago he was a vice-president of a church club which dropped out in the way I have indicated. His share of the fines incurred by the club is about fifteen shillings. If he cares to pay up he can get clear of the suspension. I have known ministers who were presidents of their clubs of whom it was recorded in their local papers: "The Rev. So-and-So has been suspended from taking any part in football through the failure of his church club to fulfil its fixtures". Arbitrary? I have no criticism to make of the Football Association. It does its work well, and the defaulting club deserves punishment. In fairness to other clubs, fixtures should be kept.

The other possible result of the club's continued non-success is this. Players are sought from outside the church circle. One or two at a time are drafted in. Before the end of the season is reached the club is a church club in name only. Is there a rule of the club (there often is of the League) that players must attend the Sunday School, the Bible Class, or the services of the church a given number of times in every month? Even if the rule is worth making—and I am dubious about it—to break it is the easiest thing in the world, and to enforce it, the hardest. Who would dare to omit from next Saturday's team list the name of the player who is scoring more goals than all the rest of the forwards put together, merely because he's been absent from church for a month? Try it on, my earnest friend who has the welfare of the church so much at heart. You will find, if you do, that you may as well pick no team at all. The others want their star player—and they're not playing unless he does.

I know of a Sunday School League in the North of England which had that rule. So that it might be sure that it was duly enforced, it began a system of inspection. A Wesleyan friend of mine, a League official, paid a surprise visit to a Bible Class of his own denomination. His purpose was to inspect the attendance register. Fifteen young men had been marked "present". Only

eight were there! The register had been "faked" that day in the interests of the football club. How many times it had been "faked" before my friend could not discover. An isolated case? I would like to think so. My observation and judicious inquiry made me feel all too sure that the "nursing" of the football club was so vitally important, that even common honesty went by the board. Wesleyans, Primitives, Uniteds (as we then called them), Baptists, Congregationalists, and Anglicans were all in it. Very few of those church clubs kept the rule, or did not make skilful attempts to evade it.

I learnt this also, of course. Those players, the story of whose misconduct filled me with such shame, were not (with rare exceptions) "church" players at all. They had been called in to complete a team, or to make it worth while from a playing sense. I do not even criticize the committee of the club which finds that to be the "way out" from an intolerable situation. In the long run, the club which continually loses is seldom a credit to its church. Some bitterness creeps into the club and in all probability into the church itself.

Is there another side to all this? Most assuredly, yes. I have known churches whose crowd of young men enhanced the prestige of their church as players and sportsmen. They "played the game" and played it excellently. Their clubs were a real boon and blessing to those churches. It is largely, I am sure, a matter of strength. If a church has sufficient young men attached to it who have football ability (I would consider thirty the minimum for the running of one eleven) a club can function which will, in every way, uphold the honour of that church. Those players—yes, again I have seen this happening—will staff its Sunday School and Bible Class and Youth organizations—and sing in its choir. That splendid association of sport and service is not rare.

I would sound a final note of warning. Ministers, Deacons, Society Stewards and others, who give their names as Presidents, Vice-Presidents, or members of committees of their church football clubs, are accounted as belonging to those clubs. The club's financial obligations are their obligations. A fixture list (in the eyes of the Football Association) is a contract. Within its powers the Association punishes His Reverence the President as it does the player, for a breach of that contract.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

I. HAPPY DAYS.

The news of the death of Lady Whittaker, the widow of Sir Thomas P. Whittaker, brought back many memories of days when it was good to be alive. In the first decade of the century T. P. Whittaker was Liberal M.P. for the Spen Valley, and he had no more enthusiastic supporters than a group of youths who during these ten years ceased school and began university life. Even before the 1906 election these boys were keen politicians; so far Labour had not ventured to put forward a candidate, and they had no doubt that the Liberal Party was the embodiment of righteousness and justice, freedom and progress. In 1904 or thereabouts Lord Londonderry, then President of the Board of Education (father of the present Lord Londonderry), came to address a Tory meeting in the largest hall in the constituency. It was a ticket meeting, but in some way I do not recollect four or five of us had secured tickets and were seated in the middle of the area. No opposition was expected, and Lord Londonderry, to say the least of it, was not a ready speaker. The first interjection threw him off his balance altogether, and as he floundered more and more, the audience became restive, and yelled "Chuck 'em aht" and made rude and angry comments on our behaviour and our appearance, our ancestry and our ultimate destination. We had, however, established ourselves on a row of chairs fastened together, and it was almost impossible to remove us. The meeting became more and more out-of-hand as our heckling persisted, but truth will out, and it must therefore be chronicled that it ended in our defeat: Mr. Whitaker Thompson, I think his name was (I do not vouch for the spelling of his name, which has two snags!), an Alderman of the L.C.C. and Tory candidate for Otley, was to second a vote of thanks: he was as nimble of mind and tongue as Lord Londonderry was elephantine; he knew infinitely more about the technique of the business than we did; our crude interruptions he tore to shreds and turned the laugh against us; and for that meeting at any rate he was the saviour of Toryism and the Empire.

But we had not long to wait for revenge. The election of 1906 came along. Spen Valley was a safe Liberal seat, but a Tory candidate was found to keep T. P. Whittaker employed. I am almost ashamed when I remember the way we treated the poor man. He was a nice, inoffensive fellow, who never harmed anybody; he knew little about politics, but he was an Alderman of the Bradford City Council, and his speeches were almost entirely concerned with the work of that Council, and the part he played in it. We counted him fair game, and we had the mercilessness of youth; towards the end of the campaign, to our great delight, he complained he was being followed up and down the constituency by "a gang of educated young men", who were spoiling his meetings! "Educated young men!" Our heads, big enough before, swelled almost to bursting. Soon oral questions were ruled out, and only written questions allowed. I carefully watched the way these were handled, and the following night during a speech on the Bradford City Council prepared my question. The agent's method was to glance at the questions, and, if they seemed satisfactory, pass them on to the standing candidate, who "answered" them. A question had to satisfy that preliminary scrutiny, and when I saw the coloured card on which mine was written pass the agent, I knew we were

in for a good time. He had read the first words, "Are you in favour of the abolition of the House of Lords—", and the candidate read so far aloud, and then stopped, with reddening face. The audience sensed that "something was up", and demanded that he should go on, and he reluctantly read "and substituting for it the Bradford City Council?" ! Pandemonium !

Four years went by, and then came the first 1910 election, a three-cornered fight, with Labour in the field for the first time. I was then in Oxford, and did some political work in London and the rural areas round Oxford as well as in the Spen Valley. The fight there was fierce, and for the first time there was doubt about the result : the Tory candidate was a Sheffield brewer, with hordes of motor-cars, and nobody knew how many Liberal votes would go to Labour. I remember Sir Thomas and Lady Whittaker coming into the Committee Room of which I was in charge on polling day. Lady Whittaker asked, "How are things going?" I said, "Very well. We're in by 1,000". She replied, "Oh, no. Sir Thomas is very anxious. It will be a near thing". I said, confidently, "If this part of the constituency is typical of the whole, it will be at least 1,000". It was 1,378—if memory does not play tricks.

The things I did that day ! Although Whittaker was so keen a Temperance man, one publican sent a message in the middle of the day to say that he had nine voters in his house who were at the moment prepared to vote Liberal ; if they were left they would probably be too drunk to vote at all, or even drunk enough to vote Tory ! I told my brother to get two cars by fair means or foul ; he did (Tory cars, I suspect) and the nine duly came along. I hope they put their crosses in the right place.

Sir Thomas was unduly elated by his victory, and "put his foot into it" in his speech after the declaration of the poll. Speaking of the attack from both sides, he first dealt faithfully with the brewers, and then went on, "From the other side we have faced a campaign of slander, misrepresentation, and lies, and we have driven it back to the gutter from whence it came". I shivered when I heard that, and said to a friend, "He'll have to pay for that one day". So he had, and much sooner than we expected, for another election came before the end of the year. There was no Labour candidate, but those who had voted Labour in January came to the meetings, and as soon as Sir Thomas rose yelled, "Gutter, gutter !" He explained that he had only meant that slander, misrepresentation, and lies came from the gutter, but it was no use. They would vote Tory rather than vote for him, and he scraped home by the smallest majority he had known—was it not 496?

I will draw a veil on the strange things that have befallen Liberalism in the Spen Valley since those happy days. I am sometimes sorry for the young people of to-day. They have many things we had not thirty years ago, but they have no political enthusiasm ; they have no Party and no cause which they feel stands for freedom and right, to which they can joyfully and wholeheartedly give all their strength. The League of Nations might have been such a cause ; but now young people do not know where they are : pacifism, isolationism, collective security, press on them with bewildering force. The few blindly give themselves to Fascism and Communism, but the many—? Can the Christian Church find the way to provide youth with the outlet for its idealism similar to that which Liberalism provided in those glorious days? I wonder.

ALBERT PEEL.

II. ROSES IN DECEMBER.

There are complaints that our October number contained nothing about cricket. For this there were many reasons. Not that I did not see Yorkshire beaten—or the remnants of Yorkshire after the Selection Committee and the Middlesex bowlers had done their worst. But I was out of the country for some weeks and I did not see a single Test Match. September, however, found me in Folkestone, and the lure of Festival Cricket was too much for me; when a ticket for ground and pavilion for six days, with admission to three Cricket Balls, can be obtained for 15s., it takes more than a Yorkshireman to resist, even though the dances make not the slightest appeal. This was, strangely enough, my first experience of Festival Cricket, and most enjoyable it was on the whole. It was perhaps good discipline that there were no Yorkshiremen playing; indeed the only Northerners were Paynter and Wilkinson, though we had the Derbyshire Popes as stock bowlers, and Voce for the second match.

The games were between the Australians and an England XI, and teams labelled Sir Pelham Warner's XI and England Past and Present. Attention at times was divided between the game in the middle and the occupants of the enclosure; "P.F." was there all the time, and old cricketers like Jerry Weigall and J. R. Mason were in evidence; C. B. Fry's voice carries a long way, and many not in his circle were able to enjoy not merely his reminiscences of games of long ago, but his onslaughts on the Selection Committee and his advocacy of the ideas he sets forth in the *Evening Standard*—that a forcing batsman like Barnett should be No. 1 for England, that Bowes is our best bowler, and so on.

The outstanding feature of the week was Frank Woolley's goodbye. He bowled an over or two, scored 58 in three innings, and made one or two characteristic slip catches. His departure cast a shadow over the Festival, for it was hard to think that the most graceful batsman English cricket has known for a generation will be seen at the wicket no more. For 32 years Woolley has united dignity and grace and skill, and given pleasure to tens of thousands; his beautiful timing has meant that an effortless swing of the bat has sent the ball racing to the boundary; there has been nothing tawdry or vulgar or cheap about his play. Sir Pelham Warner made a delightful speech when Woolley was presented with a radiogram; the English sportsman is almost invariably a sentimentalist, and Patsy Hendren, whose good-humour enlivened the last game, was not the only one who mopped his eyes when "P.F." spoke about "this game of cricket which we love so much—perhaps too much". To think that schoolboys the country over will no more be able to look at Woolley as exemplar is sad indeed.

Little need be said about the Australian match. O'Reilly got the 100 wickets for which he has laboured so strenuously, the Australian Barnett batted freely and showed that he will trouble England on many a future day, and McCabe, though lucky, was more like himself than he has been all the summer. But the Australians without Bradman are less than half a team; once his inspiration departs they are not more than a good county side. The woeful exhibition on the last morning of the match would have been impossible with Bradman as captain; it left a nasty taste in the mouth. The Australians were nearly 400 on, but they went on batting until lunch time, not scoring quickly but at the rate of 50 runs an hour, and killing the game. Indignant spectators sought for a reason in vain; perhaps the festivities of the night before had left a hang-over! But the management must not let it occur again if they desire their teams to be as popular as they ought to be—and have been.

As the week drew to an end the nabobs of cricket declared that it would now be far easier to pick an English team than in June. To the ordinary man the reason was not obvious. We saw Hammond at his masterly best for a time. Fagg showed himself too good an opening batsman to be ruled out altogether, and Compton and Edrich that they possessed claims to a place in the side. But all that was known when the season began. One controversial question was settled—that Wright was a better bowler than Peter Smith. We saw also that Wilkinson was a bowler of promise, though there was no ground for a newspaper critic's statement that he was "the man of the (first) match"; on the evening of the second day, when the wicket began to take spin, he bowled well, but his length was often untidy.

Here I turn aside to discuss the strange reports of cricket correspondents. Present practically all the week, I read accounts of the matches in several papers, and was astounded by the glaring misstatements; a man caught wide of mid-on was caught "behind the bowler", consecutive boundaries to leg were labelled straight drives. Is it that reporters miss much of the game, and then do the best they can? I wonder. Certainly one of them did not see an innings by Paynter which he described: Paynter was the most popular man of the Festival, covering much ground on the boundary, and batting always as if he enjoyed it, ending with a glorious over—4, 4, 6, 4, and then a catch on the rails by Dollery.

There were many interesting moments, and it was good that boys should have a glimpse of some of the passing giants, and see three of the greatest fieldsmen the game has known—Woolley, Chapman, Hammond—standing together in the slips, or Hendren racing along at third man as of yore. It was well, too, that older men, made sadly conscious by retirements of the passing years, should see youngsters coming forward to fill the vacant places. Will they, I wondered, be able to stand the adulation and idol worship which to-day surrounds the sportsman? I was glad to learn this summer from one who knows Don Bradman well that he is absolutely unspoilt. On the other hand, one of our young England cricketers, acclaimed in winter as well as in summer, walked down the pavilion steps as if his head were big enough to overbalance his body! But he is very young, and may be if Sir Pelham takes him in hand he will recover, and in thirty years time be respected as Woolley is to-day.

A last word—about cricket and hygiene. I have often seen the most dignified and statuesque of English cricketers lick his fingers when batting, but I do not remember seeing bowlers lick their fingers before every ball, as two men did at Folkestone. Perhaps it is as well that a new ball is possible after 200 runs! And, while we are about it, may we suggest to the Folkestone Committee that there is a pavilion window which should be made much more opaque than it is?

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

The second need supplied by Religion is intellectual. All but the most primitive and feeble-witted feel the intellectual need for some explanation of the Universe in which they find themselves, if only for practical reasons. All morality, all conduct, all values are meaningless unless they rest on that explanation. Philosophy is one form of effort to arrive at the explanation. Religion is another. The first is intellectually within the reach of only a small minority. The second is within reach of all. Both forms of effort are nevertheless converging. Religion in its broad sense, shorn of sectarian superimpositions, is already within sight of Philosophy in its broad sense, shorn of intellectual virtuosities. Religion in such a sense is essential to well-being.

B. T. Reynolds and R. G. Coulson, *Human Needs in Modern Society.*

And woman, the trustee for posterity, is, from her own standpoint, excellently advised by her warning voice that bids her beware, in her inmost being, of the embraces of genius. Its ends are not her ends. It will, if it can, seize upon the vital fund of energy that she holds in trust for the future, to squander it all upon a present immortality. It will use and destroy her, *en passant,* as Hamlet Ophelia, or Shelley Harriet. It will vivisect her soul, for the sake of experience, as would seem to have been Goethe's way with a succession of female exhibits. And if she can, she will clip the wings of Pegasus and dope him tame for the shafts of the family governess cart.

Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, *The Making of a Gentleman.*

A mill-owner in the north of England was a member of a class [Methodist class-meeting] that was led by one of his employees. On one occasion the leader came to see his master on Church business, and presented himself at the front door of the mansion. The servant ordered him to the back door, to which he always went when on the business of the mill. "No, Mary", was his reply, "I am not on back-door business to-day!"

J. Scott Lidgett, *The Idea of God and Social Ideals.*

I acquired my taste for this form of sport when I began to write the life of the old poet and ambassador and Provost of Eton, Sir Henry Wotton; and I spent some years in collecting his unpublished letters. The archives of the Record Office, the British Museum, and the Bodleian Library are easily accessible and there are officials at those institutions ready and even eager to assist students in their labours. But I soon became aware that distinguished biographers preferred to make use of printed sources rather than to pursue their researches among unpublished papers. I found that since Walton's biography at least seven sketches, portraits, and lives of Wotton have been written by scholars of distinction, including Adolphus Ward and Sir Sidney Lee, but that none of those had looked at his dispatches, of which at least five hundred were preserved unread in the Record Office, or at his letters to be found in the British Museum. All these were, of course, easily accessible; one had only to ask for the packet which might contain a document of interest, and the packet would be brought to one's reading desk by a polite official.

Logan Pearsall Smith, *Unforgotten Years.*

A party must be cemented together by a principle. The Prime Minister's active mind, corrupted by the war and the subtle poison of European politics, has forgotten this truism—and he has lost count of the English temperament. The English have never cared for games. What they love is a match. Eliminate the Eton versus Harrow and they soon tire of cricket. Eliminate England and America and who cares whether *Shamrock* beats *Resolute*. So "Party" is inherent in English political nature and nothing was ever more truly said than that England hates coalitions. My deduction is that the Government will break up [1920].

Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher.

No doubt the question may be raised whether the old parochial system is not something of an anachronism. It is not self-evident that we need a vast organization, with twenty thousand trained officials, to help us to be moral and religious.

* * *

He never forgot that, as a wise Frenchman said, you can generally win if you are careful not to triumph. He walked warily and slowly.

* * *

The Orthodox Eastern Church did not do badly in 1916.

> Wherefore against the traitor Venizelos we have invoked the following injuries: The ulcers of Job, the whale of Jonah, the leprosy of Naaman, the bite of death, the shuddering of the dying, the thunderbolt of hell, and the malediction of God and man. And we call for the same injuries on those who at the forthcoming elections shall vote for Venizelos, and further pray for their herds to wither, and for them to become deaf and blind. Amen.

W. R. Inge, *Our Present Discontents.*

It is easy for those who have never been in close contact with mental hospital work to argue that at least a reasonable proportion of young women might be expected to devote their lives to mental nursing. The dedication of other people's lives to public service of the less pleasant sort has always been an enthusiastic pastime of the comfortable.

Paul Winterton, *Mending Minds.*

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS.

Contemporary Continental Theology. By W. M. HORTON. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Agape and Eros. Part II. The History of the Christian Idea of Love. Vol. I. By A. NYGREN. E.T. by P. S. WATSON. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Contemporary Continental Theology is a very welcome book. It is not for theologians only but for all interested in the present circumstances of Continental Christianity, and that ought to include all readers of this *Review*.

A book was badly needed which should describe in concise and intelligible language the catastrophic change in the religious outlook of those on the Continent who still hold firm to the Christian faith. In this country Anglo-Catholics speak much of certain Russian Orthodox or Neo-Thomist theologians, while Scottish Presbyterians especially dwell much on the contributions of Barth and Brunner. But there are few who know the Continent so well that they can describe its modern tendencies in theology in so sure and interesting a way as Dr. Horton. Where he is dealing with the German and Swedish theologians with whose writings we are familiar, we have found his description admirable in its insight and sympathy. We are still more grateful for those sections of the book which rebuke our ignorance: his account of the Orthodox theologians of whom we knew only Berdyaev, and of the Roman Catholic theologians, Maritain and Przywara, whom we knew for the most part only at second-hand, and of Dutch and Czech theologians of whom we have to confess almost complete ignorance.

The very strangeness and even extravagance of much contemporary Continental theology makes its study of special value. As Dr. Horton puts it,

> What Continental theology lacks in *balance* it makes up in *depth;* while Anglo-Saxon theology tends to push its practical good sense to the point where it endangers the sense of the sublime, without which theology becomes as prosaic as arithmetic.
>
> *Every* great tradition in religious thought has been quickened into new life by the apocalyptic crisis which has come upon Western civilization in our time; and it is only Continental Europe, so far, that has felt the full force of that crisis.

From that crisis there has emerged in contemporary Continental thought what Dr. Horton aptly calls "the dimension of depth". The Bible, the Relation of God to the World, the Soul of Man, the Mystery of Iniquity, the Work of Christ, the Mystery of the Future—all these are now understood by this dimension of depth which was lacking in the genial Liberalism which belonged to the age of prosperity and peace.

It is impossible in a brief review to do justice to the rich contents of this book. Dr. Horton has not allowed his study of Continental theology to deprive him of his sense of humour or to make ponderous his style, and, for all its learning, it is written with admirable lucidity and often with a pretty wit. This is a book not merely to read but to possess.

We have already reviewed in these columns the E.T. of the first volume of Nygren's *Agape and Eros,* and pointed out its great suggestiveness. When referring to the book at Ministerial Conferences and the like, we have been told that, owing to its forbidding title, ministers had thought it to be a book only for scholars. Instead, it is full of illuminating interpretations of the Gospels and so full of value for preachers. But the book before us

deals with the *history* of the Christian Idea of Love, and is thus primarily for scholars interested in the development of Christian thought. Only indirectly does it contribute to the preacher's task.

In the second, and as yet untranslated, part of his historical volume, Dr. Nygren describes the synthesis of the Hellenistic and the Christian conceptions of love in Augustine's doctrine of *caritas,* the dominance of this conception in Mediaevalism, the renewal of the *Eros* motif in the Renaissance and of the *Agape* motif in the Reformation "so that the two motifs fell apart". The part here translated contains only the first "chapter", and is restricted to the Patristic period before Augustine. It has for its title *Nomos, Eros* and *Agape,* for, as Dr. Nygren shows, early Christianity was concerned not with two motifs, but with three: the Old Testament *Nomos* motif, the Hellenistic *Eros* motif, and the New Testament *Agape* motif.

> Of the three most influential representatives of ante-Nicene theology, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen, each represents one of these. Tertullian is decidedly dominated by the Old Testament *Nomos* motif; Alexandrian theology (Origen) shows how, in spite of the rejection of Gnosticism, the *Eros* motif persists in seeking entry into Christianity; whilst Irenaeus' outlook is evidence that, in spite of the rejection of Marcion's interpretation, the primitive Christian *Agape* motif remains a powerful factor in Greek theology. . . These conflicts, however, issue in victory for none of the three main types, but rather in a *compromise,* such as we find in Methodius, Athanasius and the Cappadocian Fathers.

Dr. Nygren's fresh and suggestive study puts many an old problem in a new light and in particular shows how false were some of Harnack's brilliant generalizations on the history of early Christian thought and piety. This is a book which will have to be reckoned with by all who write or lecture on the development of Christian theology in the early period.

SYDNEY CAVE.

True Humanism. By JACQUES MARITAIN. Centenary Press. 10s. 6d.

This book is a translation from the French by Margot Adamson of a work on political philosophy by a well-known Catholic philosopher: it is based on a series of lectures delivered in August, 1934, at the Summer School of the University of Santander. In general it may be regarded as an attempt to apply the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas to the modern situation which has arisen through the industrialization of society. The fundamental conception of St. Thomas which pervades every department of his philosophy and theology is that of two orders, one of nature and the other of grace, arranged in such a way that nature forms a preparation for grace and alternatively grace forms the completion of nature. "Grace", said St. Thomas, "does not destroy nature, but perfects it".

In the special sphere of political philosophy the above general principle was applied through the conceptions of the State and the Church. It is the work of the State to establish the common good, which consists in the general happiness of its members: this is here considered on the earthly or natural plane, where man is viewed simply as a rational being. But the Church has the task of raising man to the supernatural good, which is God: this it does by means of its supernaturally revealed dogma and its supernaturally endowed sacraments. The sacraments actually impart grace, which makes possible to man the theological virtues of faith, hope,

and love, as well as assisting him in the pursuit of the natural virtues of prudence, fortitude, temperance, and justice.

In the Middle Ages this scheme was implemented by means of the dual powers of the Holy Roman Empire and the Medieval Church, which together organized all life in a Christian direction; the State in idea, if not always in fact, working to support the Church in its spiritual guidance of men, and the Church lending a consecration to the temporal work of the State.

Maritain sees that this order of things has passed and cannot be revived. The essence of it, however, is a "true humanism", where man is directed and assisted by the grace of God. From the Renaissance onward this true humanism has largely disappeared out of politics. Instead of it there has been on the one hand a simulacrum of the consecrated authority of the medieval ruler in the temporal autocracies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (as in the *ancien régime* of France): on the other hand, there has been the liberalism which revolted against this with a false idea of human freedom making the individual the basis of society, which it derives secondarily through the social contract. Maritain is equally opposed to autocracy and liberalism: the question, then, is how a modern equivalent can be found for the medieval social order. Our philosopher asserts that the principles of St. Thomas can be carried out in more than one way, in accordance with the exigencies of different ages and conditions. He supports this doctrine by a reference to the Thomist principle of analogy—all good creatures in different degrees show an analogy to God: so similarly in various ways ancient and modern orders of society can exemplify the one ideal of a State working for the common good and preparing the way for the work of the Church.

As to how this is to be done to-day, Maritain is not altogether clear: he keeps to broad outlines and avoids too much detail, in which a philosopher can so easily become bogged amid the multitude of economic and social questions. But he repudiates the external control of the State by the Church, and envisages a pluralism of social orders with mutual interplay. It is natural that a Frenchman should make a great difference between industry and agriculture: the latter is to be run on the family principle (as now by the French peasant), while the former is imagined as organized in corporations in which the workers share not only in the profits but also in the direction. Capitalism is to go, and something like syndicalism to take its place.

As to politics proper, there is to be universal suffrage, but the representatives of the people are to be indirectly chosen, exactly how is not said: anyhow, parliamentary institutions are outworn and are doomed. The supreme ruler is to be chosen by a referendum.

Finally, where the Medieval Church sought for an external control of the State, present-day Christianity (of course, Catholic Christianity is meant) will seek to influence society through unofficial groups and movements. There is to be general toleration of ideas, and the principle is to rule: "He that is not against us, is for us". It is hoped that in the way indicated the whole of society may be permeated with Christian principles, by some consciously accepted, by others unconsciously. Thus a real Christian society may be advanced under modern conditions, and "true humanism" established in our time.

The trouble about such books as Maritain's is that they remain almost entirely in the sphere of generalities: nevertheless, as Hegel said, "ideas have hands and feet", and the propounding of such a set of conceptions as those contained in *True Humanism* may lead to reflection as to how far

they fit the present need, and how best what is valuable in them may be turned into actual practice. Maritain, however, writes too much with his eye on the special situation in France for all that he says to have a direct bearing on England.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Idealism of Giovanni Gentile. By ROGER W. HOLMES. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.

This is a clear and interesting exposition of the philosophy of Gentile, in which its special characteristics are well brought out. It is shown that it belongs to the idealist movement which began with Kant, and which proceeded through Fichte and Schelling to Hegel. Gentile's closest affinities here are with Fichte and Hegel, and especially with Fichte.

Kant undertook to show the part played by reason in the organization of experience. What is given through the senses is organized in the pure forms of space and time and by means of the categories of the understanding. But Kant retained a "thing-in-itself" by which to explain the data of the senses : it is from the thing-in-itself that these mysteriously come to us. Fichte was not satisfied with this explanation, nor did it seem to him that Kant's categories were sufficiently justified from rational grounds : Kant had taken them with some modifications from the Aristotelian logic and had accepted them without further inquiry. Fichte now undertook to derive both the categories and the thing-in-itself from the internal motion of the Absolute Ego, which in the process of its self-realization first creates the Non-Ego as its object and then strives to overcome the distinction it has made. Hegel followed Fichte but substituted Absolute Spirit or Absolute Thought for the Ego, and sought to deduce from its immanent dialectic not only the opposite of thought, which is nature, and the overcoming of this opposition through philosophy, but also all the details of the long way by which the dialectic proceeds, so that no part of experience should remain outside the development.

Gentile shares with Hegel the assumption that the principle of philosophy is Thought, or, as he says, the Logos. But he does not seek, as Hegel does, to embrace the whole of experience within the immanent dialectic of the Logos ; but rather returns to the narrower sphere of Fichte's philosophy which pursues the idea of self-realization through epistemology and ethics only. Further, Gentile differs from both Fichte and Hegel, in so far as he rejects the notion of an Absolute, whether an Absolute Ego or an Absolute Spirit, and identifies the Logos simply with the process or act of thinking unsupported by any metaphysical substratum or subject : for Gentile actual thinking is itself the only metaphysical entity. Logic and Metaphysic are one and the same thing.

The result of this change is to limit philosophy still more sharply to epistemology and ethics. What with Fichte was instinctive becomes with Gentile deliberate and intentional. So far from wanting to emulate Hegel's *Encyclopædia* which brought all things within the scope of the dialectic, Gentile reduces philosophy to pure thinking in the sense that all that cannot definitely be brought under this head must be excluded. The object of thinking can only be thinking itself. All common-sense knowledge which has an object outside itself, and equally all science, since it also has an external object, must be extruded from philosophy. Gentile, *qua* philosopher, cares for none of these things. They are beneath the level of philosophical contemplation, and they must be abandoned when we philosophize.

This is a very radical and very ruthless definition of philosophy. If Gentile decides so to define his subject, there is nothing to prevent him. But one is painfully reminded of the adage : "For those who like this kind of

thing, this is the kind of thing they like". It is not probable that a philosophy which deliberately ignores experience (for that is what it comes to) will be permanently successful—short cuts are seldom satisfactory. The true aim of philosophy can be nothing less than the rationalization of all experience, nothing being left out. It may be very difficult to rationalize experience, and the philosophical systems which attempt to do so may be very imperfect. But surely to say that nothing shall come into philosophy but the act of thinking itself is to decide beforehand for a philosophy barren and unfruitful. The aim of philosophy being to rationalize experience and its method being that of reflection, no doubt all we can hope for in the present life is an asymptotic approach to the perfect system we seek. But even such imperfection is better than curtailing the task. The problem of the universe is not to be solved by turning one's back upon it, but by a more sedulous application to its difficulties. It may be added that Mr. Holmes, though he is a warm admirer of Gentile, in the end moves towards a criticism of him, which, if not as stringent as the above, is yet of the same nature. His book is to be recommended both for exposition and criticism. It is a very good piece of work.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

M. Daniel-Rops's *The Poor and Ourselves* (Burns Oates, 2s. 6d.) is translated from the French. Its author, "one of the leading figures in the intelligentsia of the religious revival among the post-war generation in France", deeply moved by the problem of destitution, calls on the Church to grapple with it; "nothing can resist the force of charity when it is pure, disinterested, real".

Students of ascetical and mystical theology will be grateful for Père Garrigou-Lagrange's *The Three Ways of the Spiritual Life* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.), a translation of a work in which the Dominican theologian summarizes the contents of his *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation* and *L'Amour de Dieu et la Croix de Jésus*. Perfection consists in obedience to the two great commandments; the normal way of sanctity is the "infused contemplation" of the mysteries of faith; passive purgation of the senses marks entrance into the illuminative way, and purgation of the spirit entrance into the unitive way of the perfect. These theses are expounded with abundant references to Catherine of Siena and John of the Cross.

There is good reason to thank Mr. Arthur Waley for his translation, *The Analects of Confucius* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), and not least for the full introduction and careful annotations. Those who master this Introduction will be well grounded in the study of Chinese life and character. Here are one or two of the Analects:

> The Master said, To have faults and to be making no effort to amend them is to have faults indeed!
>
> The Master said, I once spent a whole day without food and a whole night without sleep, in order to meditate. It was no use. It is better to learn.
>
> The Master said, When it comes to Goodness one need not avoid competing with one's teacher.

With the *Analects* may be compared some selections from the Upanishads, translated from the Sanskrit by Mr. J. Mascaró under the title *Himalayas of the Soul* (Murray, 3s. 6d.). Sir S. Radhakrishran writes a Preface.

EDITOR.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.)

Journals and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher. Vol. IV, 1916-1930. Nicholson & Watson. 25s.

Not Worth Reading. By SIR GEORGE ARTHUR. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

The Truth about the Peace Treaties. By DAVID LLOYD GEORGE. Gollancz. 2 Vols. 18s. each.

Palestine Diary. By Col. F. H. KISCH. Gollancz. 18s.

With Vol. IV Lord Esher's revealing extracts come to an end. His career was, to use his own words, "in the ordinary sense of language, personal and obscure". For decades he declined post after post, from the Editorship of the *Daily News* and the request to write the biography of Disraeli to the Secretaryship of State for War and the Viceroyship of India. Nevertheless he possessed great influence, perhaps because of his detachment. As he wrote in 1917, after talking "very straight" to Sir William Robertson:

> I have a great pull over all these people. It is that I want nothing and they can neither give nor take away anything from me! No one else, that I know of, has achieved such independence. It was always an aim worth a good deal of effort and sacrifice. Now I am reaping the fruit. I can say what I choose.

In touch with both the G.H.Q. in France and with the Government in London, Esher's comments in the war years are peculiarly valuable. He had the highest regard for Kitchener, Haig, General Smuts, and strangely enough, for Sir Henry Wilson. There is a pathetic picture of Kitchener saying, "I have not a single friend among my colleagues", with Esher's rider, "This was true, except of old Asquith himself". This is confirmed by the entry 23 Sept. 1916:

> Asquith is the only Minister with whom Robertson can talk. The rest of the men on the Council are, in his opinion, too old or mere debaters. He sees no daylight.

Fourteen months later Esher writes:

> No one who has watched the conduct of this War can feel any confidence in the members of the War Cabinet. . . Clive writes that he attended a War Council and was amazed at the want of concentration. The members seemed unable to concentrate their attention for more than two minutes. Robertson said to him afterwards that it was really rather a good morning. "You should see them after an air-raid!"

As we read entries like these in days when another war seems all too likely, we cannot but shiver; Esher himself believed that peace could have been made with Austria when approaches were made to Briand in Oct., 1917; the negotiations came to nothing because of the jealousy and deceit

of French politicians. And so later (May, 1918):

> Did Curzon or Bonar know what was going on for months? Not they. Thus is our "democratic" country governed. What a farce. 45 millions of our people, 200 millions of Indians, 20 millions or more in the Dominions, and 100 millions in the United States, knew nothing of these peace overtures that were dished because Poincaré wanted the Rhine frontier and the coalfields of the Saar.

Thus the people were sacrificed, the people who for years had been deceived:

> This [preparation for the Great War in England] began in 1905-1906. By 1908 we had made great strides. I have documentary evidence of this.

Nevertheless Esher had no belief in a League of Nations:

> Can the human race be assumed to be "civilised" when one half has always lived and still lives a nomad life! How can you, without armed men, deal with African and Asiatic problems? . . . Do you know how many treaties of peace were signed in the hundred years that followed the peace of Westphalia? . . . It (a list) would open the eyes of the people who believe in a League of Peace bringing about the millenium.

The account of the realism of Clemenceau, knowing exactly what France wanted, and willing to assent to any idealist scheme of Wilson's to get it, rings true. Wilson's blunder in coming to Europe is stressed:

> The Paris Conference has at any rate succeeded in this, that a future war upon an even bigger scale becomes inevitable. It is something to have dispelled all doubt upon this point. It is not precisely what Wilson set out to do.

Once again we have characters summed up in a sentence or striking prophecies:

> Good honest man is Buckmaster. He just lacks something or he would have made an ideal leader.
>
> He is a bit of a statesman, this fellow [MacDonald]. A humanist too.
>
> The boy [The Prince of Wales] is a Stuart, not a Brunswick!

Clemenceau, asked by Haig what time he had to spare, replied:

> "I am 75 years old and the whole future is before me."

Of Lloyd George there are enough opinions to suggest the vitality of the man.

> 1916. [Briand and L.G.] are alike in so many ways. Of Breton or Celtic blood, physically they resemble each other. Both are eloquent; but Briand has infinitely more knowledge and he plays with L.G.
>
> 1916. there is no doubt that he means to take supreme power into his hands. He will leave no stone unturned.
>
> 1917. he is tremendously alive . . . possesses a tremendous vitality and indestructible spirit, two qualities that neutralise his instability. There is no infirmity of purpose about him, but an over-elasticity of mind. It is a rare fault and on the boarderline between intellectual vice and virtue. . . It is amusing to see him among our stolid officers. It is like a fire burning away in the midst of a frozen world.

And here we have part of the sowing of which we are reaping the whirlwind.

> 1917. [L.G.] tells the Germans that we are none of us out for territorial readjustments, when he knows well from Smuts and others that

> he dare not relinquish the Colonies we have taken and that he himself means to establish a British Protectorate over Mesopotamia and Palestine if he can. What is the use of all this? Who is deceived except a few Americans living apart from the world in New England?

Another veteran who can thrown a sidelight on the life of his day is Sir Geo. Arthur, the biographer of Kitchener, who is still to him the hero *par excellence*. Those who have no love for Courts and Armies will perhaps think for the first 100 pages that the book is rightly named, but when 1914 finds the author as Kitchener's Private Secretary, it begins to be important. There is a notable letter from Asquith to Kitchener early in 1916, when "Curzon and L.G. and some others" were trying to oust the soldier, and an *obiter dictum* of Millerand:

> while things are going well Georges Clemenceau is capable of spoiling everything; when things are going badly he may be the only man capable of saving France.

And again we have gibes at the Italians, from Paul Cambon's *Nos bons amis, les Italiens, attendent avec impatience le moment pour voler au secours des vainqueurs* to the British Tommy's reply to the incognito King Victor Emmanuel's pleasant hope that there would be no more retreat, "Oh, we shall be all right, sir, if only those b—— ice-creamers don't 'op it again". Sir George, whose avoidance of the first person is irritating ("The King came and congratulated one"; "one was consulted"), is a devout Anglo-Catholic who speaks of "Christ's Presence on His altars". Nevertheless he quotes with relish Stanton's words about Establishment: "We speak glibly of ourselves as strangers and pilgrims, but whoever heard of an endowed pilgrim or an established stranger?", and his reply to a lady convert to Romanism who said she had received special comfort from four Saints, St. Ursula, St. Faith, St. Lucy, and St. Perpetua; he too had received much help from four Saints, St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John.

As we read the volumes which flow in spate from Mr. Lloyd George's pen, e'en the ranks of Tuscany can scarce forbear to cheer. These two well-written volumes are the best of them, judged from the point of view of the historian, for their documents, especially those giving conversations between the British delegation at the Peace Conference or between the Big Four, are exceptionally valuable and revealing. Mr. Lloyd George has a gift for the striking phrase, and interest never flags through the 1,400 pages. Not that the pages are history, of course; they contain materials for history, admirable materials; but they are too much of an apologia, a selection of evidence to show that the wizard was always right and everybody else at some time or other wrong, to be history. Judgments like "thoroughly discreditable", "thoroughly dishonest", abound, and Mr. Lloyd George is so anxious to discredit Mr. J. M. Keynes—his *bête noire*, or rather, one of his many *bêtes noires*—that, though just before and just after he says Prof. Ashley was associated with Mr. Keynes in suggesting an indemnity over a period of years he calls Mr. Keynes its "sole patentee and promoter". And it is amusing to find him rebuking President Wilson, who is steadily depreciated (his "obstinate and self-centred nature") when he is not being damned with faint praise, for not being led "by the instincts of an orator", or putting Northcliffe in his place when he had no further use for him. In describing episodes like the Maurice debate Mr. Lloyd George is at his worst; he is at his best in emphasizing the part played by Lord Cecil, General Smuts, and M. Leon Bourgeois in formulating the

League of Nations scheme for which Wilson is so often given all the credit.

Mr. Lloyd George well brings out the Italian fear of the French, by whom they have been invaded so often, and quotes a cruel quip of the Serbian, M. Pashitch, in reply to a reference to Italy's heavy losses, "In battle many more men are killed in running away than in fighting".

Sonnino's "felicitous illustration", as Mr. Lloyd George calls it, of delivering a speech in a language of which you had not perfect mastery—"like a tram—it took you near your destination, but not right up to the door"—is worth noting. So is a phrase in Mr. Lloyd George's speech introducing to M. Berthelot "a book written by a Scottish theological professor, Professor Adam Smith". This is *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land,* and of it Mr. Lloyd George said that "although the work of a theologian it was so accurate in matters of geography that it had been used by Lord Allenby during his campaign". "Although the work of a theologian" is good.

There seem to be slips on pp. 145, 283, 285, and 1,211; lines are out of order on p. 1,158; we have "consistent" for "inconsistent" on p. 1,172.

Not the least important of Mr. Lloyd George's pages are those referring to Palestine, and Colonel Kisch's Diary, written while he was Chairman of the Zionist Executive from 1923 to 1931, is again valuable material for the historian. While it is clear from Mr. Lloyd George's account of the Peace Treaties that Great Britain realized that the Mandate for Palestine would be no profitable sinecure, probably at his most pessimistic he never thought of a situation like that of 1938. In Palestine, however, political, social, economic and religious questions are all interwoven and, added to the conflicting promises made to Arabs and Jews, they make an unusually complicated problem.

Colonel Kisch makes clear that some at any rate of the British officials in Palestine, notably Mr. E. T. Richmond, did not believe in the Mandate, and that the Mufti of Jerusalem constantly blocked every effort at Arab-Jewish co-operation. Colonel Kisch recognizes that a majority of the population of Palestine was opposed to the Mandate, but he believes, not without reason, that had there been no outside interference Arab and Jew could have worked together to the advantage of both. Of the Governors of these years, Lord Plumer wins Colonel Kisch's approbation; Sir John Chancellor was weak; Sir Herbert Samuel, though respected for his character and honesty of purpose, would "never follow a course necessitating strong action and radical changes in his Administration". While Plumer asked of a proposal, "Is it justified under the policy of H.M. Government? If so, I must accept it", Samuel asked, "What will the Arabs say to this?" An indispensable book to all who would understand this vexed problem.

EDITOR.

The Life of Christ. By HALL CAINE. Collins. 10s. 6d.

We have spent some of the best hours of three days with this remarkable *tour-de-force,* but we do not claim to have read it. It contains 1,270 pages of close print, 240 of which deal with "Before Christ" and 225 with "After Christ", leaving some 800 for life and teaching. In 1890 Hall Caine conceived the idea of writing a Life of Christ "as vivid and personal from the point of belief as Renan's was from the point of unbelief". He visited Palestine many times, and wrote three million words, which his sons have reduced to this volume.

The result is a book quite impossible to review. Those who expect in it romance like the Manx stories will be grievously disappointed; apart from some conjectures about Mary Magdalene and Judas there is little of

this kind of imaginative reconstruction. Rather is the book rationalization, with confident rejection of everything that does not satisfy the writer:

> Moreover, it does not in any way enhance my sense of the power of Jesus to think that he could walk on the water, or that he could make five loaves and two fishes feed 5,000 men, besides women and children.

The miracle of Cana is "a perfectly shocking story; I simply do not believe it"; the appearance of Jesus by the lake in *John* 21 is "a shocking story", "a wholly futile story", "a lamentable, childish, and dishonouring story" with "no suggestion of reality at any point whatever". A whole page is occupied with statements about the Resurrection—"I do not believe in . . .", but "I believe in the Resurrection of the Soul of Jesus".

Sir Hall Caine's method is to describe how each Evangelist treats an incident, and then to state his own conclusions. Thus:

> If the incident concerning the sword is historical it is only so as John tells it. As told by Mark it is scarcely believable. As told by Luke utterly unbelievable.

In regard to the mocking of Jesus,

> I reject the story in *Matthew* and *Mark*. I think the truth lies in a combination of the stories in *Luke* and *John*.

From which it may be gathered that Sir Hall Caine was quite prepared to take his own line. *Luke*, it may be noted, he finds "deficient in order, . . . deficient in motive".

All this should not be taken to mean that the book is worthless. Far from it. Indeed I can imagine few pieces of study which would leave the student of the Gospels better equipped than a thorough examination of the volume. In every chapter there is something worth while. . . Why, for example, is there no reference in *John* to casting out devils? . . . And with all my respect for College Professors, I doubt if there are many occupants of New Testament Chairs with the knowledge contained in this novelist's *Life of Christ*.

EDITOR.

The Psalms. Chronologically treated with a new translation by MOSES BUTTENWIESER. Chicago and Cambridge University Presses. 22s. 6d.

The great liturgical and devotional importance of the Book of Psalms secures the constant interest of scholars in its interpretation. During the last dozen years as many commentaries on the Book have been published, in English, German, French, and Italian, and by Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish writers. The peculiar difficulty of the exegesis of the Psalms is that we have so little means of assigning historical backgrounds to them. Most of the Psalms have been adapted for liturgical use, which means that even those historical references which may have been contained in the original compositions have been largely omitted or modified to make them suited for general and permanent use. Thus, it is much more difficult to date a psalm than many prophetical utterances which have retained more of their original particularity. On the other hand, we are often unable to decide the precise meaning of a word or phrase unless we know in which of the numerous possible centuries it was first used. Recent work on the Psalms has largely abandoned the attempt to find individual dates for them, and has employed the method, introduced by Gunkel, of classifying the Psalms by their "types", *e.g.*, as laments, or thanksgivings.

Prof. Buttenwieser's volume is a bold attempt to secure more precise datings and to use his results to reconstruct the history of religion in Israel.

It must not be thought that he is reverting to the uncritical ascriptions of the Psalm-titles. In fact, the only psalms which he assigns to David are part of the sixtieth and a selection of verses from *Pss.* 57, 60, and 108. He regards *Ps.* 81[5-16] as belonging to the time of Joshua and as the oldest psalm which has come down to us. He correlates most of *Ps.* 68 with the period of the Judges, and is, in fact, confident that it was written by the author of the "Song of Deborah." With equal confidence, he assigns the rest of the Psalm (together with 85 and 126) to the author of *Deutero-Isaiah,* and another group of psalms (73, 139, 39, and 23) to the author of *Job.* A favourite period of his is that of the invasion of Judaea by Artaxerxes III Ochus in 344, for which he employs *Judith.* No less than fifteen psalms (seven by one author) are used to illuminate this obscure period. On linguistic grounds he is unwilling to date any psalms as Maccabean.

I am afraid that most scholars will regard such confident datings as "too good to be true". The grounds, industriously and ingeniously sought in literary parallels and general ideas, remain largely subjective. It is one thing to say that "*Psalm* 73 is a poem worthy of the author of the *Job* drama" and another to pass on to the question "Which was composed first?", as though identity of authorship had really been established, by a certain kinship of thought and some parallels of language. It must not be imagined, however, that this elaborate book, the product of so much scholarship, is without value for those who cannot accept the author's too confident conclusions as to dates. There is much stimulating, because challenging, detail, and the translations of the Psalms are often very suggestive and interesting. The author makes a strong case for what is called the "precative perfect" in Hebrew (against S. R. Driver and with Prof. G. R. Driver), though he seems to make too free a use of the idiom in actual exegesis. The "corporate personality" of the speaker in many of the psalms is usefully recognized, as against the over-individualizing views of German scholars in general. The linguistic notes will be found useful by the Hebrew student, who will discern how much patient labour and wide knowledge lies behind the book. But the usefulness of the book will be chiefly for those who can deal critically with its far too confident assumptions.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. Edited by W. K. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome. Vol. I. Edited by Gregory Dix. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Clarke would be the first to admit that his edition of the epistle of Clement (I suppose we shall have to continue calling it "the first" though "the second" is neither an epistle nor by Clement) will not take the place of von Harnack's for scholars. But by this translation, with its adequate introduction and modest but sufficient annotations, he has done a real service for those who cannot read German and for those who have not access to Lightfoot. Particularly useful is the examination of the leading ideas of the letter. Perhaps Dr. Clarke disposes of Prof. Merrill's argument for a later date than 96 too easily; but the chronology, like other aspects, of the sub-apostolic period, is still largely shrouded in obscurity. The jacket notice is misleading in its reference to Lightfoot's translation, which is not only in his two volume edition, but also in a separate convenient volume called *The Apostolic Fathers.* And one might query the statement that "here alone can we see what the early Christians, for whom the *N.T.* was written, were really like".

Dr. Clarke has also had a hand, as Mr. Dix gracefully acknowledges, in the other book here noticed. Hippolytus, whose significance in the history of the early Church is increasingly recognized (*e.g.,* his probable authorship of the "Muratorian" Canon and of the *Epistle to Diognetus*), about 215 published this little treatise (formerly known as the Egyptian Church Order) which professes to describe the organization and inner life of the sub-apostolic church. The original Greek text is not extant except in isolated fragments, but various versions (Latin, Ethiopic, and others) enable us to recover with confidence more than ninety per cent of the treatise. While Mr. Dix's edition lacks any remarks on Church Orders in general such as formed so helpful an introduction to Prof. Easton's edition of *The Apostolic Tradition,* in other respects his work is on a much fuller scale. The present volume contains besides an historical introduction, textual materials and translation, with critical apparatus and some textual notes. We await with real interest the second volume, in which the author promises to evaluate the treatise in its relation to the study of early Christian institutions and the spirit of the primitive church.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Case for Evangelical Modernism. By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D. Hodder & Stoughton. 7s. 6d.

The Great Heresies. By HILAIRE BELLOC. Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

These two books, the one by an eminent Free Church scholar and the other by a cultured Roman Catholic man of letters, represent the two most widely separated points of view within our modern Christianity. Nevertheless they have some things in common, and in a sense are mutually complementary. Dr. Cadoux's second sentence might very well have been written by Mr. Belloc:

> It is difficult to escape the conviction that—in the welter and ferment of these present days—Christianity is under a heavier cloud than any that has overshadowed it since the days of Constantine.

Only Mr. Belloc, being unwilling to describe as "Christianity" anything that he may have in common with Dr. Cadoux, would prefer to speak of the "Church" or of "the Faith". Up to a point too—and that a critical point—Mr. Belloc would be in hearty accord with Dr. Cadoux's claim that Christianity is truth and that divinely given reason is an authoritative guide to truth. The two writers agree that faith and reason are inseparably bound up together. The difference lies in the fact that Dr. Cadoux begins with faith and ends with reason, while Mr. Belloc begins with reason and ends with "the Faith". Mr. Belloc accepts the Thomist view of reason as the foundation of all inquiry into the highest things, but as carrying us only up to a point where there emerge truths which lie beyond though acceptable to reason. These truths are given by Revelation—a term which Dr. Cadoux refuses to accept except in the quite general sense that all truth, whether scientific or religious, is an unfolding of the nature and purposes of God. On the other hand Dr. Cadoux would approve of Mr. Belloc's sentence:

> Where reason is dethroned, not only is Faith dethroned . . . but every moral and legitimate activity of the human soul is dethroned at the same time.

But there again the two writers part company, for, according to Mr. Belloc, reliance upon reason leads to the Catholic Faith, whereas, according to Dr.

Cadoux, a faith that is controlled by reason is certainly not the Catholic faith, nor indeed the faith of Luther and Calvin.

Dr. Cadoux is at pains to show us that modern Protestantism, speaking broadly, has surrendered many points of belief that were of cardinal importance to the Reformers, *e.g.*, the inerrancy of Scripture, the existence of a personal devil, the visible Second Advent of Christ at the end of the world, and the doctrine of eternal punishment. For himself, he also emphatically rejects the Calvinist doctrine of Predestination and the denial of Free Will. All this would be eagerly seized upon (unfairly no doubt) by Mr. Belloc, to support his thesis that Protestantism, having cut itself adrift from its doctrinal centre, is lapsing into humanism and is in consequence "dying before our very eyes". He declares that Protestantism, having rejected the infallibility of Scripture, which was its only secure standing ground after it had rejected the Church, has lost all religious significance, and stands before the world simply as a form of culture which is opposed to Catholic culture. There is sufficient truth in this last statement to challenge the attention of Protestants throughout the world. Protestantism as a living faith *is* shrinking everywhere, and this may be in some measure due to a failure to come to terms with the new world-outlook of today. It is part at least of Dr. Cadoux's purpose to bridge the gulf between Christianity and modern world demands.

In point of fact, Mr. Belloc frankly admits that Catholicism also is shrinking everywhere, both in social significance and in numbers, and indeed he envisages in the near future what may prove to be the final conflict of the Faith against a new paganism, atheistic and materialistic, represented on the one hand by Communism, and on the other by the ideologies ranged against it which put force in the place of God. He believes that in that struggle the Catholic Church will be reduced to the position of a mere island in the midst of a raging sea. "The Church certainly will not disappear, for it is not of mortal stuff." But it may be reduced to numerical insignificance in a world that despises it as heartily as the paganism of the third century despised it. By then, of course, Protestantism will have disappeared altogether.

Dr. Cadoux will certainly not allow Protestantism to disappear while he lives. But the point at issue between himself and Mr. Belloc turns upon the function of reason in Christian belief. Will reason carry us the whole way? Is there not something in Christian experience that calls for the admission of a factor different from that which is characteristic of science? A twofold epistemology, one for science and another for faith, has no doubt been proved unsatisfactory. And yet there is a difference which somehow calls for recognition. Science begins with sense data, and all its tests are of a sensible character—test-tubes, balances, *etc.* What are the nature and the tests of religious experience? Certainly not sense data and test-tubes. Further, it is not without significance that the truth at which science arrives is just about as different from the world of the senses as it can possibly be. The planetary-systems of the atoms are symbolic rather than exact transcriptions of the real world. They are pointers rather than facts. And it may be that in the realm of religious doctrine we need pointers of similar sort. The Creeds, *e.g.*, in their endeavour to express the content of faith may find it necessary to use symbolic language, language, that is, which points to a truth inherently incapable of exact expression. If so, we can heartily agree with Dr. Cadoux that they ought not to be used as tests of orthodoxy, and that alternative modes of expression must be recognized as equally congruous with Christian Faith. Such an admission of course would confirm Mr. Belloc's view of the moribund condition

of Protestantism, but Dr. Cadoux may be depended upon to deal with that.

As against the Barthians Dr. Cadoux contends that there is no real distinction between theology and philosophy, for the reason that philosophy cannot do its work properly without taking the truths of religion into account. But suppose the philosopher refuses to take them into account, on the ground that they rest upon purely subjective, illusory, and projective experiences? What are we to do with him in order to make him more amenable? We need a philosophy of Christian experience.

I have left myself far too little space to deal adequately with these two books in detail. Dr. Cadoux's four chapters deal respectively with "The Way to Orthodoxy", *i.e.*, the way of Truth; "Three blind-alleys", Non-Christian Humanism, Barthianism, and Traditionalism; "Traditional Christology"; and "The Way to the real Jesus". His foundation stone is the doctrine of divine immanence, and this determines his Christology. All men are in some sense divine, but Jesus is divine in a unique sense. Again and again the uniqueness of Jesus is insisted upon, but all endeavour to relate this uniqueness to a general world view by giving it a metaphysical basis is eschewed. Dr. Cadoux seems to be unduly timid at this point. The uniqueness is explained as that of an elder brother in the family. The possibility of the worship of Christ as a divine being is admitted, but the admission is robbed of value by defining worship as "reverence for worth". In this sense I may worship my mother. But that is certainly not what Christians in general mean by the worship of Jesus.

Dr. Cadoux quite rightly emphasizes the full reality of our Lord's humanity and repudiates all forms of Docetism. But is he quite fair to the Chalcedonian symbol? He suggests that the fathers at Chalcedon were responsible for the dogma that our Lord's humanity was purely impersonal and only achieved personality through its union with the divine Logos. Granted that Chalcedon poses a problem rather than settles one, it is at least noteworthy that it lays equal stress upon the human nature of Jesus and upon his divine nature. No doubt the very word "nature" is confusing, but in the assertion that Jesus Christ is "of one substance with the Father, as touching his Godhead" and of "one substance with *us* (not merely humanity in general) as touching his manhood", the Cyrillian idea of the impersonal nature of the manhood of Jesus is ruled out. We might just as well claim that according to Chalcedon His Godhead was impersonal. The difficulty in the broad sense remains, but Chalcedon ought not to be accused of throwing doubt upon the reality of our Lord's human nature, even if the Church has subsequently preferred Cyril to Chalcedon.

We wish that Dr. Cadoux had more fully developed his positive affirmations in the closing part of his book. In the nature of the case, his exposition of "orthodoxy" as he understands it was bound to include a large negative element, and some of his negations may be open to question. But of his firm belief in the saving activity of God as manifested uniquely in Christ there is no doubt. Combined with a fuller recognition of the nature and tragedy of sin, such as immanental theories are apt to glide over, there is a Gospel for the modern mind. (There is a misprint on page 70.)

Mr. Belloc's list of heresies include Arianism, Islam, the Albigensian Attack, and the Reformation. His attitude is not primarily polemical, and he can speak about these things with freshness and objectivity. It is characteristic, however, that he concerns himself for the most part with the political and military aspects of these movements and fails to deal adequately with their doctrinal or even religious significance. In dealing with Arianism he puts forward the surprising view that the so-called bar-

barian invasions were not mass-movements of Germanic peoples into the Empire, but were merely a division of the Empire among the local generals (barbarian in origin, but Roman in culture) who clung to Arianism because the army was the last stronghold of pagan influence and ideas. There is no mention of the heroic labours of Arian missionaries among the Goths.

In describing Islam as a Christian heresy which alone of the heresies developed into a separate religion, Mr. Belloc does less than justice to the character and qualities of Mohammed. It may be true that he derived some of his ideas from obscure Gnostic and Jewish sects, but it is very doubtful whether he ever was in a position to be regarded as within the pale of Christianity and therefore a "heretic". It is the military record of Islam that attracts Mr. Belloc, and he raises the pertinent question as to whether Islam may not once more become a military menace to Christendom.

The Albigensian Crusade is treated as though it was merely a French civil war, and nothing is said of the responsibility of the Church both for the war itself and for its unspeakable cruelties.

Mr. Belloc lays it down that the natural life of "the Great Heresies" is limited to about a couple of centuries. Protestantism has already passed its zenith and will soon be of no account at all as a Christian force. "There is no one left except perhaps a handful of people in Scotland who really believe the doctrines Calvin taught", though "all that is lively and effective in the Protestant temper still derives from John Calvin".

The forces of modern paganism constitute the only enemy left for the Catholic Church, and these have found their inspiration in the declining hegemony of Protestantism. Mr. Belloc finds it easy to lay the responsibility for all our modern social and political evils at the door of Protestantism, which destroyed man's faith in his freedom and in his consequent responsibility to God. Modern paganism has brought back slavery (to capitalism and to the all-sufficient State), ruthless cruelty as a deliberate policy, and the rejection of reason. In the coming conflict the Catholic Church will lose ground, but will certainly not die. Beyond that no man can speculate. It is unusual to find a Roman Catholic so frank and open-eyed.

E. J. Price.

The Indwelling God. By E. C. Dewick. Oxford Press. 10s. 6d.

The above work is further described as a historical study of "the Christian Conception of Divine Immanence and Incarnation, with special reference to Indian thought" : this reference is explained by the fact that the author is the Principal of St. Andrew's College, Gorakhpur, India. We are told that the book has been accepted as a thesis for the B.D. degree by the University of Cambridge. It covers an immense historical field, including Primitive Religion; the Hinduism of the Vedas, the Upanishads, and the Gita; Buddhism, Jainism, and later Hinduism; Pre-Christian thought in the West; Judaism, Zoroastrianism, and Islam; the teaching of Jesus Christ; the experience and doctrine of the Church in the first three centuries; later Catholicism; Protestantism; Modern Immanentism and the Reaction against it. Naturally, where so many things are described, there cannot be a great deal of detail; but what is said is in general sound and sensible, and the survey will have its uses as an introduction to the subject of Divine immanence.

As to positive results, here too the words "sound and sensible" best characterize the author's own teaching. It is summed up in an argument showing that immanence and transcendence each imply the other, when the terms are applied to God. A God purely transcendent can have no

meaning for us unless He touches us at some point and so far becomes immanent: conversely, the immanence of God must be supplemented by His transcendence, otherwise there would be nothing to enter into or dwell in the Universe, since God would be regarded as being one with the Universe.

It is recognized that some minds are more impressed by the idea of immanence, some by that of transcendence; and it is pleaded that there should be room for both kinds of mind in the Christian Church. It is clear that the author, with his eye on India, is afraid of the dominance of a Barthian Christianity onesidedly transcendentalist. He wants room for a sympathetic appreciation of Indian religion as a preliminary to the commendation of the Christian gospel to India.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The New Immortality. By J. W. DUNNE. Faber. 3s. 6d.

Mr. Dunne brought himself into prominence by his book *An Experiment with Time*, which was followed by a more detailed exposition of his theories in *The Serial Universe*. Now he has given us *The New Immortality* as a popular explanation of the same doctrines—"reading without tears". But it is doubtful how far the populace will find the book intelligible: the ideas in spite of clever writing still remain difficult; while, so far as they are clear, they do not really get us very far.

The gist of the teaching appears to be as follows:—(1) Reality is identified with "Action" in a four dimensional or space-time world. Action is energy multiplied by time, and the element of action is an "invariant", *i.e.*, it is independent of the particular co-ordinate system we are using. Hence it is a physical reality, something unalterable by mere changes of the metrical system: the measures change, but the thing does not.

(2) Properly speaking, I also belong to the same four-dimensional world, in which I am a thing represented by a world-line. But I am also endowed with a "travelling-field" which moves along my world-line, and provides me with the form of consciousness which I associate with my senses. The "self" is the intersection of the world-line and the travelling field. Birth and death form the limits in which this intersection takes place: my world-line exists beyond them, but in this "beyond" there is no presentation through the field. If any view of Reality is possible after death, it will no longer be of a presentational character.

(3) What it may be is prophesied to us in dreams. In our dreams our attention no longer is limited by the presentational field to the environment we can infer from it, but can range freely in a diffused way over the whole of Reality. This is a foretaste of the immortality in which we are delivered from the limits of common existence, and ourselves as a part of Reality can truly know Reality as it is.

There does not seem to be anything very new in this doctrine except the modern phraseology. Aristotle held that the active intellect which was the Divine part of man survived death, while the passive intellect including all that is traceable to sensation and memory disappears. In other words, there is an immortality of reason, from which all that is personal is eliminated. Certainly, in Aristotle's system the active intellect is its own object, whereas Mr. Dunne's diffused attention has "action" as its object; but that is largely a difference of psychological climate, as between Greece in the fourth century B.C. and England in the twentieth century A.D. The essential point is that in each case the immortality described is wholly impersonal.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Jesus Divine and Human. By J. A. Findlay, M.A., D.D. Epworth Press. 5s.

The problem of the Person of Christ is a subject of perennial interest, and any fresh and candid attempt to solve it must be welcome. When all has been said and done Jesus Christ remains, as Schweitzer says, the unknown. His Person is unique, He is God and man as no other ever was, and yet just how this could be, and how what the Church calls the two natures in one Person could be united, baffles our psychology. This is the question to which Dr. Findlay recurs in the volume before us, and to the solving of which he only claims to make but one more contribution. As he says, "The Church is under a cloud, for her divisions expose her weakness, the Creeds are in a language meaningless to most educated men, psychology claims that she can explain away religious experience, and He alone remains the one unsolved problem of history". Dr. Findlay approaches the problem as it is set before us in the four Gospels, and he seeks its solution through a careful study of all that they claim on behalf of Jesus and of the words that they put into His mouth. He is evidently well abreast of all the latest New Testament scholarship and makes good use of form criticism and of recent discussions of the title Son of Man, and he claims to show from the evidence he thus marshals that while Jesus was God He was also conscious of being man. In other words, He was God and became man. This book is a real contribution to the understanding of the two natures in one Person so far as the New Testament can contribute to such understanding, and offers the best possible defence of the orthodox position. But the big psychological problem involved remains.

W. B. Selbie.

The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought. By Nadejda Gorodetzky. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Madame Gorodetzky is a Russian refugee who has done a fine work for her unfortunate compatriots in Paris. Her book, *L'Exil des Enfants*, gives an unforgettable picture of the life of these exiles. But her main interest is the hope of reconstituting a reformed Russian Church. With this in her mind she has studied theology both in Paris and at Oxford, and has now produced a book which may well serve as another link between Eastern and Western Christianity. She finds in Russian folk lore and literature an evangelical call to meekness, humility, voluntary poverty, and non-resistance. In many quarters in Russia she believes that humiliation has been accepted as a national ideal, and she appraises the growth and expression of this ideal in Russian fiction and in the development of the Radical movement. From this she passes on to examine the humiliation ideal in its devotional and moral applications, and then comes a more theological study of the Kenosis in Russian theology, particularly in the work of Bulgakov. It is all very interesting and will be new to most English readers. It throws a much needed light on the mind and heart of the Orthodox Church, and should make for a better understanding of it and of its work in the past. Whether its present suffering will lead to the spiritual revival for which the best of its sons and daughters are longing and praying, the future alone can show.

W. B. Selbie.

From Morality to Religion. By W. G. de Burgh. Macdonald & Evans. 12s. 6d.

The relation between religion and morality has long been a subject of debate among philosophers. In one of his earlier books, *Towards a Religious Philosophy*, Dr. de Burgh has maintained that religion is the best foundation, not only for the good life, but for the truest wisdom. He now

raises the subject again in a new form in these Gifford Lectures, "From Morality to Religion". Here, too, he seeks to show that religion and morality are both forms of rational activity, and that only religion can satisfy the claims of morality or answer the questions which morality asks and leaves unanswered.

Dr. de Burgh's main argument is well thought out and clearly stated. It constitutes an admirable defence and rehabilitation of the moral argument for theism. We are shown the baselessness of any merely humanistic system of ethics, and the necessary part played by religion in providing a sanction for morals and shaping the content of the moral order. On the vexed question of the distinction or relations between the "ought" (or the right), and the good, Dr. de Burgh takes a middle course and argues that they are independent. He therefore seeks to "give both of them their due as co-ordinating principles of conduct". His contribution to this much-debated question is very illuminating.

The same may be said of the more theological side of his argument. Here, again, he keeps an even balance between the subjective and objective aspects of religion. He says:

> In this matter of religious experience, we have to steer our course between two quicksands, to ground on either of which means shipwreck. On the one side there is the danger of ignoring the specific character of religious experience as a divine revelation, which *ex parte Dei* is unerring, and derives its truth from a source wholly different from the source of our knowledge in other fields. On the other side there is the danger of forgetting that the voice of God speaks *ad modum recipientis,* in sundry ways and in divers manners, to the ignorant and savage as well as to the wise and prudent, but utilizing the imperfect instrument of human sight and speech.

Following on this Dr. de Burgh finds a link between religion and morals in the specifically Christian experience of the love or grace of God:

> It is not a question of our conceiving God in our own image, but of discovering the image of God in us. Granted that the moral argument affords strong ground for inference to a God in whom moral values have their sources, the knowledge that this is so is robbed of meaning unless we know also that God is Good.

In his final lecture Dr. de Burgh shows how a Christian philosophy, along with the Christian practice of the rule of faith, supplies the only possible solution of the riddle of this universe. That he is justified in this contention no reader of his clear and close-knit argument can doubt. His book is a very real and timely contribution to the philosophy of religion.

W. B. Selbie.

The Psychology of Social Movements. By Pryns Hopkins, M.A., Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Yet another book on applied psychology. It is advertised as "A Psychoanalytic View of Society", and its author insists that in the study and practice of psychology lies our only hope of correctly diagnosing and so, in the long run, curing all the ills—social, economic, political, and personal—with which mankind is afflicted. Dr. Hopkins is an ardent disciple of Freud and goes even further than his master. To him psychology means psycho-analysis, and it is in the application of the psycho-analytic method that he finds both his philosophy and his practical direction as a social reformer. In morals he is a Benthamite, and the goal he sets before him is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. He is, however, frank

enough to confess that psycho-analysis, in itself, is not a cure of man's troubles. What he contends is that until it is used "man cannot begin to work out his salvation". Psycho-analysis, in other words, clears the way and prepares the ground for complete social reform as well as for personal happiness, but how these are ultimately to be attained Dr. Hopkins does not very clearly show. Probably he would find the solution of all problems in education and the schoolroom, which he considers "must be the chief concern of all who seek to make a better world". But by education "I mean something fundamentally more complex than the mere learning of alphabets and figures. I mean in effect the whole business of upbringing". He regards psycho-analysis as "itself an education of an unusually fundamental sort", and it must be rigorously applied. All teachers themselves need to be psycho-analysed before they can be entrusted with children, and they should then be able to practise psycho-analysis themselves and to deal with children accordingly.

Dr. Hopkins's enthusiasm for his subject is most praiseworthy; but it often leads him astray. One cannot but wish that he had cultivated on the one hand a sense of humour, and on the other a more exact critical faculty. The need for this is seen in the way in which he quotes instances from the actions and sayings of very small children and then goes on to infer, without any real warrant, that all children do this or that. Even to the most hardened reader of books on psychology his emphasis on infantile sexuality (mainly in the form of anal eroticism) seems excessive. He is very much against war, and also against the abuse of alcohol and tobacco. But his analysis of the psychological causes of war is to say the least one-sided, and of the connexion he believes to exist between tobacco and homosexuality nothing that can be called evidence is given. Apart from these blemishes the book is interesting and thought-provoking, but there is too much easy simplification about it, and its outlook is certainly too pessimistic. It is difficult to believe that unless we all submit to and practise psycho-analysis there is no hope for the future and human life must remain "nasty, brutish, and short".

W. B. Selbie.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Not only Old Testament students will be grateful for the essays on the Old Testament written by members of the Society for Old Testament Study, now edited by Dr. Wheeler Robinson under the title *Record and Revelation* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.). The Editor's Essay on "The Theology of the Old Testament" is a masterly summary. Dr. J. A. Montgomery deals with "The New Sources of Knowledge", Drs. Johannes Hempel and Otto Eissfeldt with the literature of Israel, Drs. Wardle, Theodore Robinson, and Rowley with its history, Prof. Lods, Prof. Porteous, the Rev. N. H. Snaith, and Principal Elmslie with Israel's Religion. Other contributors are Professors S. H. Hooke, D. Winton Thomas, and Dr. Oesterley, and after an essay on "The Old Testament and Judaism" by the lamented Claude Montefiore, Dr. W. F. Lofthouse concludes with "The Old Testament and Christianity". A special word of praise is due to the bibliography and the index.

The "School Clarendon Bible" is planned for Middle Forms and School Certificate candidates. The latest volume is Miss B. K. Rattey's *St. Matthew* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.).

Although marred by a good many slips, the Rev. G. H. Richardson's lively book, *Biblical Archæology: its Use and Abuse* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.), is full of interest. It is a pity that the traditionalists have tried to involve archæologists and higher critics in warfare : and Mr. Richardson has done well to show that Driver was right in claiming that archæology has not disturbed the findings of criticism. He does not stop there, however, for, turning to the "ultra-liberals", he argues that Pan-Babylonians and North Arabians (Cheyne and Jerahmeel) have alike gone astray. A chapter on the place of archæology, its achievements and its limitations, ends a book which Bible students would do well to read.

The Rev. Dorothy Wilson's *The Gospel Sources* (S.C.M., 2s.) consists of a course of popular lectures based on Streeter's *The Four Gospels*. Ministers will find this a useful little book to lend to young people.

Dr. Campbell N. Moody's books are always short, but they are always full of insight, and **The Childhood of the Church* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is no exception. Dr. Moody makes the usual comparison between converts of the first century and converts today; he shows that the first century was no "golden age" of the Church, but that the early Christians had a very imperfect apprehension of the Gospel, and that, again like modern converts, they found Christianity unintelligible and unacceptable. Christ crucified was the stumbling-block, and Dr. Moody shows how in both periods the Word of God is adulterated; missionaries preach about God and the Ten Commandments, not about the saving power of Christ. The early Christians regard the Gospel as a new Law; faith is rather an intellectual belief than trust in a Person; of faith and grace alike there is an imperfect understanding. We strongly recommend readers to buy the book and follow Dr. Moody's argument.

It is a pleasure to meet a piece of work like the Rev. F. E. Vokes's *The Riddle of the Didache* (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.). Its sub-title, "Fact or Fiction, Heresy or Catholicism?", suggests a popular rather than a scholarly work, and Mr. Vokes is sometimes over-confident : "it is certain" always arouses suspicion. But the volume is a real contribution to scholarship and well deserves thorough examination, in which Mr. Vokes might have helped by printing the text in full. He concludes that *The Didache* dates from the end of the second century and derives the greater part of "Two Ways" from Barnabas with a few additions from Hermas. It is an "attempt to write in apostolic language an account of the customs of the Montanists, . . . Montanism dressed up in an ill-fitting New Testament garb". Mr. Vokes reaches his results by building up a case step by step. He has a logical mind, a welcome habit of summarizing his argument, and a wide knowledge of the relevant literature.

In *Creeds in Conflict* (Dent, 6s.) the Rev. Leslie Belton has gathered together a mass of information about modern creeds—Spiritualism, Christian Science, Yoga, Spiritual Healing, Sufism, Neo-Zoroastrianism, to mention but a few. He then discusses recent movements such as the World Congress of Faiths. The whole provides a useful book of reference, though the frequent exclamation marks are rather out of place.

Nonconformists have recently begun to pay more attention to the Christian Year, and they will be interested in the Roman Catholic *The Year's Liturgy* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.). This first volume deals with The Seasons, and is edited by the Abbot of Farnborough.

**Hear my Prayer*, edited by the Rev. F. E. Christmas, is one of the best things Hodder & Stoughton have done (5s.). Here are 500 pages culled from ancient and modern writers on various aspects of the subject of

prayer. We have Brother Lawrence and Evelyn Underhill, Thomas à Kempis and W. Adams Brown, von Hügel and Alexander Whyte, and many more.

Dr. E. F. Braley's "Book of Suggestions for the Modern Teacher", *The Teaching of Religion* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), contains a good deal besides syllabuses of religious teaching and specimen lessons for infant, junior, and senior schools. There is a concise summary of the "religious problem", and a discussion of the specific qualifications of teachers of religion. If one accepts the position that it is right for all men to be taxed for the teaching of one particular religion, there is no doubt that the agreed religious syllabus taught by "genuine and competent teachers" is the way forward. Dr. Braley does his best to be impartial, but it is amusing to note that "the churches" = "the denominations", and "the Church" = "the Church of England", and that every book in the bibliography of the section, "The Faith of the Church", is by an Anglican.

Mr. E. H. Hayes has again prepared the *Concise Guides* (N.S.S.U.), which Sunday School Teachers have found useful for so many years. The *Beginners, Primary, Junior* and *Intermediate Notes* are 3s. 6d., the *Morning Notes* 2s. 6d., Dr. Townley Lord's *Notes on Scripture Lessons* (the "International" Lessons, being the Junior Course) 3s. 6d., and Mr. W. D. Bavin's *Pocket Notes* 2s. 3d. and 1s. 9d.

Sequels are notoriously risky, but the Rev. R. S. Wright has given us a Second Series of *Asking Them Questions* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), answers to questions presumably asked by youths. The answerers are a varied assortment, fundamentalists and modernists, professors and Boys' Brigade Captains, Jesuit and Orthodox, and so on. Some of them, *e.g.*, the Rev. Conrad Skinner, show how talks to boys should be given; others, *e.g.*, Dr. Inge, have not the remotest idea how to find contact with the adolescent mind. And what is a boy who asks "Are Sacraments necessary to make a Man a Christian?" to make of this—

> Along the hidden ducts of intricately organic society, the non-institutional "Christian" may owe far more to the Churchman than he knows.

Or this?

> Even if Sacraments are thought of as being merely declaratory—as being no more than the presentation in symbolic action and picture of truths which are independent of these portrayals—it must surely be allowed that they are declaratory in a dynamic way.

A useful volume for those who have to answer youths' questions, but not for youth itself.

Mr. H. V. Morton's *Through Lands of the Bible* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is the mixture as before, and a very pleasant mixture it is; Mr. Morton knows exactly where human interest and personal adventure should be introduced to break up the guide-book passages. Palmyra, Baghdad, Ur, Egypt, with the Pyramids, Luxor, Siwa, Alexandria, Sinai—as Mr. Morton visits these we see the background of the Old Testament, and obtain much light on the New. The gem of the book is the description of the days spent in the Greek monastery on Mount Sinai. Finally we come to Rome, and there is an amazing transformation; suddenly the becoming reserve of the previous pages is displaced by a confidence which at times must be called credulity ("it is certain" and similar phrases are now frequent). The account of a canonization in St. Peter's redeems this rather intrusive chapter.

Messrs. Nisbet have in recent years rendered great service to the Church through their "Library of Constructive Theology". Two of the ablest of the contributors to that series, Dr. C. H. Dodd and Dr. H. H. Farmer, are now represented on the same publisher's list by shorter books, *History and the Gospel* and *The Healing Cross* (6s. each). Dr. Dodd's "Hewett Lectures", which cover in part the ground of his *Apostolic Preaching*, are as fresh and lucid as all he writes. History consists not merely of occurrences, but of events which are occurrence *plus* meaning. Christianity finds in history the primary field of divine revelation, because it is the field of divine action; it holds one event to be uniquely significant, giving a unique character to the whole series to which it belongs, an event which is the mighty act of the transcendent God. "Christianity recognizes no spiritual revelation which is not directly related to the historical reality of Jesus". This leads to an examination of the *preaching* and the *teaching* of the central tradition of the Church, which yields "a coherent picture of Jesus Christ, what He was, what He stood for, what He said, did, and suffered". The Church in proclaiming this Gospel is the instrument of a divine intervention in history. A fruitful study, although not everybody will agree with the place given to the Eucharist in the last chapter.

Dr. Farmer's "Studies in the Christian Interpretation of Life" also regards the Church as "called of God to be the organ of His purpose in relation to the whole process of history" and as "the one supernatural and world-wide society in a world which appears to be flying to pieces". Let preachers who desire suggestions for a sermon—or a series of sermons—on the Church turn to Dr. Farmer's chapter on "Vows" ("I will pay my vows now in the presence of all his people"), and they will not be disappointed. And so with many another chapter, for this book is real preaching.

Pagan and Christian Symbols (Skeffington, 2s.). A desideratum indeed, and we wish the Rev. A. Henderson had expanded these "Studies in Comparative Religion", in which he discusses the sign *Tau*, the sacred fish, the serpent, *etc.* Another little book on a kindred topic is the Rev. F. Hall's *The Growth of Religious Ideas* (Daniel, 2s.), in which the author, who has been blind for twenty years, discusses "Religion and Magic", "Religion and Sex", and "Our Debt to Ancient Egypt".

We suppose that Dr. Scott Lidgett grows older like the rest of men, but nobody would believe that the Beckly Lecture, *The Idea of God and Social Ideals* (Epworth Press, 2s 6d. & 1s. 6d.) was the work of an octogenarian; the keenness of the analysis of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr's *Interpretation of Christian Ethics* in the early pages and the masterly historical survey, with its wide sweep and accurate balance (pp. 68—95), might be the work of a man in the prime of life.

We mark Mr. J. Middleton Murry's **Heaven and Earth* (Cape, 10s. 6s.) with an asterisk not because it is immediately concerned with pastoral problems, but because it is the work of one who through much tribulation is beating his way through to a philosophy of life. The book marks a stage in that Mr. Murry is not so pre-occupied with himself, and no one could read it without learning much and receiving stimulus. Its theme is not easy to discover; it is "to reveal the actual growth of the modern world through the minds of some great men who experienced in act or imagination the travail of its becoming"; taking in turn Chaucer, Montaigne, Shakespeare, Cromwell, Milton (Cromwell is extolled, Milton depreciated), Rousseau, Goethe, Godwin, Wordsworth, Shelley, Marx, and Wm. Morris, and

handling them in far from uniform manner, Mr. Murry is mystical, rhetorical, homilectic, literary, political, as the spirit moves him. He will not suit the precise; theologians will scarcely be satisfied as they search his pages for a definition of "Christian". Nor will the historian accept all Mr. Murry's interpretations, perhaps not even all his facts. He still suffers, too, from the false perspective of contemporaneity—to his great trio Jesus, Shakespeare, Keats, he still adds D. H. Lawrence (and Father Hopkins seems now to be on the same level as Keats !). But his book is earnest and timely, even urgent in its insistence that nothing short of regeneration can save mankind. If we were to discuss all the points we have noted as Mr. Murry proceeds on his rather leisurely way, we should need the whole of this issue. Suffice it to say that no one will regret the time given to these illuminating pages.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc's *The Question and the Answer* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is a stimulating essay in apologetics, though at the end he drags in an Infallible Church by the scruff of the neck. His three chapters are "The Great Question", "Whether God Be" and "The Witness to Revelation".

If we relate the effect of Miss V. Sackville-West's poem *The Solitude* (Hogarth Press, 21s. & 5s.) upon us as we read it will be the best tribute we can pay. The dedication "put us off", and is, we think, a mistake; at first the poem did not grip, but as we read on we became intensely interested in the search for light and peace: will it be found in the silent night, in thought, in love, in God, in beauty, in truth? And, at the end, which is no end, we felt we must go back and trace the path again. Here are two stanzas to illustrate Miss Sackville-West's theme and method:

> No Church I need; I seek my God direct,
> Knowing myself unchosen, unelect,
> And pray without a priest's association.
> Less Christian I, though Christ himself could claim
> God as his father, straight in derivation.
> Would Christ, God's son, deny such fatherhood
> To me, mere human struggling for the good,
> Christian in all but name?
>
> For still we clamour, we, unsatisfied,
> For clearer answers to our loud demand;
> Let there be clear command or reprimand,
> We will obey, believe, and fight the foe.
> If you indeed sent down your son to suffer pain
> Such as we know, poor creatures of your whim;
> If you indeed made sacrifice of him,
> In that tremendous legend when he died.
> Why, why, and why and endless why again?
> Why, God, Almighty God, why stoop so low
> To favour in your unexplained design
> So small a planet by so great a sign?

There are some ways in which Congregationalists and Baptists can learn from Methodists, and not the least of these is in the enterprise of denominational publishing. Why the Epworth Press is able to send out a stream of really good books while the Independent and Kingsgate Press merely have a trickle is a mystery. Is the secret to be found in that the Boreham series proved a reliable income-bringer, in the greater loyalty of Methodists, or in their superior business capacity?

At any rate, in the "Lincoln Library" (5s. each) we have a series of

which, if the first four volumes are typical, the Epworth Press will have no reason to be ashamed. Dr. W. L. Northridge's *Psychology of Pastoral Practice* moves along well-trodden—some of them too well-trodden—paths; there is much of Freud and Jung and too little, perhaps, of Adler. The best thing in a volume which many ministers will find serviceable are the chapters on "Confession and Spiritual Direction", and the recommendation that the churches should provide homes of healing in great centres of population, staffed by qualified medical psychologists.

One never knows where the Cadoux doctor brothers will break out next; Smyrna as birthplace and the Cape in youth can account for but little of their learned versatility. Having written on the Parables and the Second Gospel, and broken a lance with C. J. on pacificism, Dr. A. T. now gives us a remarkably good book, *Shakespearean Selves*. This is called "A Study in Ethics", and it is well worth reading by students of Shakespeare and students of ethics alike. Now it may be true that "ethical interest is characteristic of Shakespeare's plays", and that "Shakespeare's ethics are inexorable", but it is dangerous to make Shakespeare a moralist or a preacher; even to say "Shakespeare's emphatic reiteration that the man whose chief concern is self-regard is heading for spiritual catastrophe" is dangerous because it is so difficult to know when Shakespeare is speaking his own mind. Dr. Cadoux examines the plays in turn, with a shrewd observation which will undoubtedly win him a place among Shakespeare's interpreters. It is interesting to find that he considers that Hamlet knew "To be or not to be" was overheard, and that his secret is to be found in "a sensitiveness in personal relationships which is at the heart of moral life".

Is the Rev. T. W. Coleman right in suggesting that he is the first Free Churchman to write on mysticism? Whether that be so or not he has done well to draw the attention of Free Churchmen to *English Mystics of the Fourteenth Century*, for, although he has little that is new to say to students of the subject, his book will serve as a most useful introduction. He writes of the *Ancren Riwle*, Richard Rolle, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich, and Margery Kempe, who gives him his best chapter.

Mr. E. E. Kellett's *Religion and Life in the Early Victorian Age* is a very readable account of life in the middle decades of the 19th century as viewed from a Methodist minister's home. About life in Methodist circles, the attitude to children, the reading of the Bible, the relations of religion and business, and of religion and politics, Mr. Kellett writes with the urbanity, insight, and skill we have come to expect from him.

Mr. Kellett is using his leisure well, and all whose business it is to write or study or read history should read his *Aspects of History* (Cape, 5s.), in which his wide knowledge and mellow wisdom find full expression. In writing of history as theology, literature, propaganda, science, "both art and science", politics, ethics, and economics he has many wise things to say, and he says them in such a way as to make the reader grateful.

We have found the addresses printed in the Rev. C. H. K. Marten's *On the Teaching of History* (Blackwell, 4s. 6d.) extremely fascinating. Drawing on a long experience as Senior History Master at Eton, Mr. Marten is able to survey the Teaching of History in England with intimacy and authority. He discusses textbooks, the School Certificate Examination, "What a Boy may learn from the Study of History"; and "Public Schools in the Last Hundred Years"; and also gives some "Practical Hints to the Youthful Historian". The lightness of touch and the aptness of illustration suggest that Mr. Marten must be an ideal teacher. All who teach

and all who are interested in history should read these lively and informing papers. We note that Mr. Marten quotes Prof. Foster Watson as inclined to give to Nonconformist Schools and Academies the credit for such progress as occurred in the teaching of history in the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

New volumes appear in two series which are reflecting credit on British historians. We have Vol. II of Methuen's eight-volume "History of Medieval and Modern Europe" (16s.), Dr. Z. N. Brooke dealing with the *History of Europe* from 911 to 1198, a period which for many students is shrouded in thick darkness. Again one is constrained to wonder why Cambridge so monopolizes the medieval period? Cannot Prof. Powicke do something about it? We are unconvinced by Dr. Brooke's apology for jettisoning the maps he had prepared; they are essential in a book of this kind. In the "Oxford History of England" Mr. E. L. Woodward deals with *The Age of Reform, 1815-1870* (15s.). Here is a period which should be as light as noon-day, considering the number of biographies and the variety of histories which have been devoted to it. Mr. Woodward always writes so delightfully that even the familiar fascinates. He is perhaps at his best in the political sections, though his chapters on "The Organization of a Civilized Social Life", "Education", "Religion and the Churches" (*not* Mr. Woodward at his best; the Census of 1851 with its influence on ecclesiastical controversy, is, we think, not so much as mentioned), "English Literature and the Development of Ideas, "Movements in the Sciences and Arts", and "The Condition of the People", are packed with information. The bibliographies are again full and useful, and there are six maps.

Happy is the man who, reaching the age of four score years, has a mind as well stored as that of Dr. G. G. Coulton. And not only well stored, for Dr. Coulton's knowledge is accessible; he has essentially a tidy mind in which facts are arranged and co-ordinated. Those who read all that Dr. Coulton writes—and no serious student of English history fails to do so—will know that there is little that is new in *Medieval Panorama* (Cambridge Press, 15s.); but where else will one find within the covers of a book of 800 pages such a picture of the life of medieval England? Here you have the contents of Dr. Coulton's previous books gathered together, with the findings of many other scholars arranged in support. The writer says the volume provides what he wishes he had had fifty years ago. Fortunate indeed is the generation which starts its study with his book in its hands.

The continuation of Dr. S. Maccoby's *English Radicalism* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) deals with the years 1853 to 1886. Again drawing largely on periodical literature, Dr. Maccoby has given us a well-documented survey of a period in which the Dissenters were the spear-head of the Reform and Radical movements. His two volumes will be indispensable for the student of the social and political history of 19th century England: already we begin to see the emergence of those interests which finally resulted in the Labour Party.

We hope that the Unitarians are not acquiring an inferiority complex and becoming unduly sensitive. There is no need for them so to do, for, like another small community, the Friends, they have been an example to larger denominations in their zeal for learning and for social service. The Rev. R. V. Holt's *The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) is almost a catalogue of their achievements, and we can imagine that it will be in regular use as a book of reference. We were alarmed to find two slips during our first minute with

the book: Prof. Coupland was "W. J." instead of "R.", and we wondered in vain who "Peel, W.", who appears frequently in the Index, could be; he turned out to be Sir Robert. This suggested care in using a book which contains much information not easily obtainable.

A Hundred Years of British Philosophy (Allen & Unwin, 25s.) is a translation of Dr. Rudolf Metz's masterly *Die philosophischen Strömungen den Gegenwart in Grossbritannien* (1935), corrected and enlarged for the translation, which has been made by three distinguished English philosophers, Profs. J. W. Harvey, T. E. Jessop, and Mr. Henry Sturt, the editor-in-chief being Prof. J. H. Muirhead. This massive volume of over 800 pages provides a reliable book of reference for students of philosophy and religion. It is thorough and scholarly, and up-to-date. The section on Positivism, a movement that shone so brightly for a time before flickering out, shows Dr. Metz's skill in summary and in criticism. The writers he selects for special treatment in his final chapter, "Theism and the Philosophy of Religion", are Balfour, Inge, Streeter, von Hügel, and Tyrrell. It is interesting to note that while there is the mere mention of Fairbairn's name, Martineau gets 16 pages in an earlier chapter. Author, editor, translators, and publishers are all to be congratulated on this work.

It is well that Mr. Winfred Rhoades has been introduced to Britain. Those who have read his contributions to *Advance* during the years have been grateful for a sensitive and sympathetic spirit, who, conquering physical weakness himself, has proved a help to many. Though he has not "J. B.'s" phenomenal range of reading, there is much that is reminiscent of "J. B." in his essays. The Keynote of **The Self You Have To Live With* (Bles, 3s. 6d.) is the chapter, "It's the Soul that Needs Treatment". Without using the psychologist's jargon, Mr. Rhoades understands the mind and its troubles. Thousands of burdened, worrying people would benefit if they followed his wise counsels. We have "left" for "lift" on p. 81.

All ministers of religion would do well to read the Rev. J. A. C. Murray's **Introduction to a Christian Psychotherapy* (Clark, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Murray recognizes the great opportunity psycho-therapy presents to the Christian Church, though he is fully aware of the dangers of amateur psychology; it is doubtful, however, whether the professional psychologists, with their patronizing and reluctant admissions that religion may have a therapeutic value, will recommend this book. The last chapter, "Character and Training of the Therapist", is extremely sound, though undue stress is laid on the need of therapists to be themselves analysed; far more important than analysis is the qualification here set forth:

> There is no one so sensitive to atmosphere as your neurotic, and good character is its own infection; you cannot cleanse a wound of the mind, as of the body, unless you yourself are aseptic.

Mr. Murray unduly depreciates Adler and exalts Jung, and at times he makes unqualified statements, as about hypnosis, on which he is positively dangerous. We learn also that "everybody dreams . . . the man who never dreams has yet to be born". Where Mr. Murray learnt this does not appear. It would be a great mistake to judge the book by such statements, or by slips on pp. 104 and 250; it is well worth reading.

While, as its author recognizes, it has many journalistic traits, Mr. Paul Winterton's *Mending Minds* (Davies, 8s. 6d.) is an informing and important contribution to the study of mental disease and its cure. Mr. Winterton has spent some time visiting mental hospitals in this country, and his

description and his conclusions are alike of value. How many people, we wonder, know about voluntary treatment, or about malaria therapy, by which G.P.I. is now often arrested or cured? High praise is given to the staffs of hospitals, though a more stable and contented nursing staff could be secured if nurses (not probationers) were allowed to "live out"; on the other hand, Mr. Winterton is critical of local authorities, which are often "apathetic or else actively obstructionist on financial grounds". There is a vast difference in the efficiency of institutions throughout the country; if all could be lifted to the level of the best, Mr. Winterton's story would have been very different. It is good to have his assurance that evidence for cruelty and wrongful detention is lacking.

To "The Needs of To-day" Series (Rich & Cowan, 3s. 6d.) three admirable volumes have been added. Dr. Eleanor A. Montgomery's *Can Psychology Help?*, written in a style that all might read, discusses pleasantly and helpfully the various ways of living—the superficial, the reluctant, the anxious, the resistant, and the acquiescent. Dr. F. E. England's *Can Human Nature Be Improved?* answers both his own question and Dr. Montgomery's with an emphatic affirmative, though, of course, he finds in religion even more than in psychology the means for improvement. (It is pleasing to see Browning once more used, and effectively used, in apologetic of this kind). Dr. A. Herbert Gray's *Love: The Only Solution*, is a passionate plea for the love that never fails, which, if only men will let it, will solve all the problems of human society—in the home, in politics and business, and in world affairs. Where there is the love, the love that God is, hatred, injustice, oppression, and war are impossible.

In *The Web of Life* (Davies, 3s. 6d.), Lord Lytton has written a perfect little book to aid mothers to tell their children (at about six years of age) about life and birth and love.

It is hard to tell why we found *Human Needs in Modern Society* (Cape, 10s. 6d.) so satisfying a book. Its psychological discussion on human needs in Part I and its analysis of "a society in transition" in Part II contain little that is new, and its plea for mutual understanding, sympathy, and goodwill seems but a small result at the end of all the argument. But the writers, Messrs. B. T. Reynolds and R. G. Coulson, have profound insight as well as intimate knowledge of the problem. One a professional soldier, the other heir to landed property, they both passed through the War and were in the Army of Occupation on the Rhine. Afterwards they found peace-time society had no place for them, and realized the great psychological change which befalls men in that position. The essential needs which must be met if civilization is to survive they find to be the following:—

1. Satisfaction of primitive needs.
2. Satisfaction of Self-regard.
3. Moral teaching, education for citizenship, Religion.
4. Satisfaction of Other-regard.
5. An Integrated Society.

Religion, they confess, ought to satisfy these needs, but the churches have altogether failed to do so. All those connected with the churches would do well to read Mr. Coulson's pages concerning them, even though they are the least satisfying part of the book. Like many others the writers have come to the conclusion that at the moment the churches have a real opportunity to serve society, but that that opportunity must be speedily seized or it will pass.

The Rev. Wm. Paton has given us some good books, and he always writes with refreshing vigour. We read *World Community* (S.C.M., 5s.) when our hearts were sore about the betrayal of the Czechs, and it may be due to this that we did not find its argument so clearly developed as we had expected from a Scot, a Presbyterian, and Mr. Paton. It is that

> the secret of world community lies in that which is outside the human community, and that, therefore, the Christian gospel of God is no mere inessential element which can be surrendered under pressure, leaving certain community values that can be co-ordinated with others.

Or, as the Preface has it, it is a commentary on the remark by one who felt

> alternately that the Church was a completely hopeless organization and that it was the only hope of the world.

The *World Dominion* survey, *Whither Arabia?* (5s. & 3s. 6d.), is particularly timely. Dr. W. Harold Storm, its Editor, describes the land and the missionary opportunity it presents. There are 38 missionaries in a population of 7,000,000, and the Christian community is practically non-existent (the summary gives it as 23 in number !).

Miss Margaret H. Brown's *"Heaven Knows"* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) brings home to the reader the conditions in China today. It tells how a countryman and his family were drawn into the whirlpool of war, and of their experiences in the bombardment of Shanghai.

The Rev. Cecil Northcott's *Who Claims the World?* (Livingstone Press, 1s.) pictures the world of to-day and the "supreme urgency" of Christian Missions. Its advocacy is convincing until the later pages, when financial references to "covering its present work" and "adding another eighty posts" suggest a conservative conception of missionary enterprise which seems far removed from that, say, of Dr. Pickett mentioned in our Editorial pages.

Though it contains some good essays, *Great Catholics* (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.) is on the whole disappointing. The Editor's rather pretentious opening essay (had it been half as long it would have been twice as good) discusses biography, but it does not let us know the editorial plan. Were Catholic names put into a bag and the requisite number shaken out? Why have we Gregory VII and not Innocent III, St. Anthony and not St. Francis? Why do Paul and Augustine and Teresa get 12 pages while the Editor takes twenty for Francis Thompson and another twenty are devoted to Dom Augustine Baker. It would be interesting to discover how many Protestant scholars know who Baker was : indeed, one of the merits of the book is that it will introduce to Protestants half-a-dozen "great Catholics". Some of the essays the Editor should have rejected outright, and it was a mistake to introduce biographies of two living men. The references to authorities which appear in one or two instances should have appeared in all. It is not surprising that the writer on John Dryden prefers to remain anonymous, and it is well to know that it was Cardinal Bourne who defeated the attempts of Birrell and McKenna to solve the education problem. Mr. Douglas Woodruff's "The Abbé Migné" is the finest essay in the volume, though Dr. Orchard's on St. Catherine of Siena runs it close.

In *Modern Biographies* (Nelson, 1s. 6d.) Lord David Cecil has made seventeen selections, and not one is better than that from *The Stricken Deer*. Among other writers included are Edith Olivier, Catherine Carswell, Evelyn Waugh, and Philip Guedalla.

Mr. Ernest Raymond's *Through Literature to Life* aroused in us such enthusiasm that we eagerly opened his *In the Steps of St. Francis* (Rich & Cowan, 8s. 6d.). On the whole we were disappointed, for at times the book is slangy, strained, and affected ("It must be the deuce and all to have begotten a Francis"; "this is to be the truest book that ever was written"). This is a pity, for Mr. Raymond can write with a simple intensity appropriate to his subject; the chapter on the death of Francis, *e.g.*, is all that it should be. The illustrations are good and helpful.

Mr. J. Lewis May falls below his usual level in his *Fénelon* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.). Even his style suffers: to find him giving us clumsy and cumbrous sentences is surprising indeed. Then Mr. May deems it necessary to show he is a "good Catholic"; and so, while ten years of Fénelon's life can be summarized in less than a page, several pages can be given (in a book of 200) to a discussion of Protestants and persecution. Where the book is valuable is in its descriptions of Fénelon's writings; even here, however, we have much quotation and too little of Mr. May's criticism, and a much too great readiness to draw parallels between Fénelon and Mr. May's hero, Newman. The volume, we fear, left the impression of a piece of book-making.

The Friends may find Miss Doris N. Daglish an embarrassing acquisition. She thinks that there are only two ways of regarding spiritual truth, Catholicism and Quakerism (the grudging admission that Whittier "in his best devotional verse can come very near Newman and Keble in refinement and intensity" is significant), and there are signs that she is not altogether happy with the latter. Liberal Protestantism is her abomination, with its "bright books full of a sentimental concentration on the Synoptic Gospels", and indeed the object of Miss Daglish's hearty detestation is contemporary religious thought "which not only climbs [to bring the Lord Christ down]. It positively hikes." "Bright", and "perky" in addition, are the sketches in Miss Daglish's *People Called Quakers* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) in which she writes of Thomas Story, John Woolman, some eighteenth century women, Thomas Wilkinson, Stephen Grellet and Caroline Stephen.

There is always a place for books on the great men and women of the Church, and the Rev. Henry Cook's *Heroes of the Faith* (S.C.M., 5s.) will be found very useful either to give to young people or to use in preparing talks to them. Its 24 sketches are classified under Early Martyrs, Early Missionaries, Teachers, and Saints.

Recently we noticed Mr. A. L. Maycock's *Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding*. Now we have—and it is one of those books which it is in every way a pleasure to greet—Dr. B. Blackstone's *The Ferrar Papers* (Cambridge Press, 21s.), which prints the Life of Nicholas, the *Winding Sheet*, a Collection of Short Moral Histories, and a Selection of Family Letters. Together these make a source book of great value, especially as the editing is skilfully done. What beautifully clear handwriting these Little Gidding people had! Is it because they had time to write?

There seems to be no limit to Prof. R. B. Mowat's industry. Were that the only virtue he possessed we should tremble at the rapidly lengthening list of books which stands to his name. But the clarity of style which marks all that he writes makes the reader open each new book with pleasurable anticipation, and his *Rousseau* (Arrowsmith, 15s.) well deserves the encomiums it will receive. Prof. Mowat admits that John Morley's work is a classic, but he points out that access is now possible to a vast collection of Rousseau correspondence which was not available to Morley.

Those who heard C. E. Vaughan lecture on Rousseau will value this new biography.

Dr. Dorothy Marshall's *The Rise of George Canning* (Longmans, 15s.) well deserves the praise Dr. Harold Temperley's Introduction bestows upon it. Miss Marshall has made excellent use of papers—letters and a journal—previously unpublished, and the result is an admirable portrait of the young Canning, talented, with a good conceit of himself, and not afraid to press his claims either in matrimony or in politics. The volume revolves round Canning's relationships with Pitt, and closes appropriately on the latter's death. Miss Marshall is miserly with dates, but that is the only criticism we have to offer.

The fact that books about Gladstone continue to pour forth is a tribute both to his remarkable achievements and to the complexity of his character: in the latest of them, *Gladstone and the Irish Nation* (Longmans, 36s.), Dr. J. L. Hammond calls him "at once a politician and a great prophet, a great Englishman and a great European, a great Minister and a great minister of justice". This does not mean that Dr. Hammond is blind to Gladstone's faults—his tactlessness, his hurry and impatience, his obsession with finance—or unaware of his blunders. He has given us a competent account of the Irish Problem which will stand the test of time, and one that is as readable as it is able. There is some repetition ("Ireland, that cloud in the west" appears, we think three times before p. 85), and in a book of 750 pages some excisions might have been made; interesting as are the pages on Bradlaugh and on "Gladstone and Democracy", they are scarcely relevant, though Dr. Hammond does his best to make them so. There are few slips (is Haslingdon right on p. 323? Faringdon Street is certainly wrong on p. 569, and Guiness on p. 634, though the mistake here may be Gladstone's—Morley has it right on p. 637). The number of points we want to discuss is legion. How far, for example, would Christians today endorse Dr. Hammond's comments on private morals and public life? A great book in more senses than one.

To the rising generation, we suspect, the name Wilfred Scawen Blunt means nothing, and it is to be feared that those who are older remember him merely as one who used to make himself a confounded nuisance to those in authority. It is well, therefore, that Miss Edith Finch should have written *Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 1840-1892* (Cape, 15s.), in which we have the story of a lover of England who was an anti-Imperialist, a country squire passionately fond of Sussex and of Egypt, a poet who kept a stud of Arab horses, an aristocrat who fought and suffered for freedom for Arabs, Indians, and Irishmen. Blunt and his wife travelled in parts of Arabia hitherto untrodden by white men, and they acquired both respect and affection for the Arab people. Miss Finch gives us perhaps a little too much of Egyptian politics when we desire more about Blunt and his wife and family, but on the whole she has done her work well. A. J. Balfour as Secretary for Ireland comes out of an encounter with Blunt rather badly, and it is surprising to find him saying, "There is no more vain and foolish thing than remorse".

The glorious service of Mary Slessor in Calabar must not be allowed to obscure other valiant soldiers of the Cross, and Mr. Alexander Gammie has done well to write *Cruickshank of Calabar* (Pickering, 2s. 6d.), in which he tells the story of the Aberdonian (1854-1937) who laboured in Calabar for 55 years, building up a church of 1,500 members.

We deplore the hours we have had to give to another, surely unnecessary, biography of Oscar Wilde: Mr. Boris Brasol's brains and industry

could have been employed to much better purpose than in *Oscar Wilde* (Williams & Norgate, 16s.), which includes a chronological index of 30 pages. By his parentage and early environment, as well as by the name Oscar Fingal O'Flahertie Wills, Wilde was heavily handicapped from the start. Dandyism, vanity, and intemperance led up to the scandalous *cause célèbre* and the squalid later years. With a more disciplined youth, Wilde's gifts might have borne finer fruit. Those gifts it would be foolish to depreciate, although to call *De Profundis* "the mighty symphony of a repentant soul, one of the deepest, most touching and loftiest creations in world literature", as Mr. Brasol does, is extravagant nonsense. Wilde, even when allowance is made for his plagiarism, had a pretty wit and an ear for the music of words. Mr. Brasol might have emphasized these merits at the expense of the pages devoted to the trial. We are glad to be reminded of "Mr. Whistler always spelt Art, and we believe still spells it, with a capital 'I' ", and of Whistler's reply to Wilde's "I wish I had said that", "You will, Oscar, you will".

Some ten years ago we ventured to prophesy that in a generation's time D. H. Lawrence would be little more than the subject for University theses. The decade that has elapsed has shown considerable progress in the transition of Lawrence from the extraordinarily praised to the merely interesting. In this transition Mr. Hugh Kingsmill's clever book *D. H. Lawrence* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) marks a stage. Written in the Strachey manner, it is more than "debunking"; it skilfully describes a tormented spirit in its various relationships. Unfortunate indeed were all those who had to live with Lawrence; he was incapable of steadfast friendship; neither in his life nor in his books could he get away from his supreme interest, himself.

It is impossible to review Dr. E. Greenly's two massive volumes, *A Hand through Time* (Murby, 18s.), not so much because some of the chapters only a geologist can understand, but because the work is a tribute to a beloved wife and cast in a form which makes criticism in the ordinary sense out of the question. After eleven years' separation the course of true love began to run smoothly for Annie Barnard and Edward Greenly, and they had 36 years of married life in which she proved a perfect comrade. Geologists will revel in the intimate accounts of work on the Geological Survey, notably in the North of Scotland and in Anglesey, and in the sketches of the most notable men of their craft. In the concluding chapters Dr. Greenly expounds his belief in immortality.

All that Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith writes has a spice of its own, and his autobiographical sketch *Unforgotten Years* (Constable, 10s.) will be eagerly tasted by his admirers. It tells how he, the son of American Quaker missioners, who were a furore in England in his childhood, was beaten black and blue (for his good) by his mother when he was an infant, and reached the state of justification at 4 and of sanctification at 7; a little later —and no wonder—"the whole supernatural scheme of things seemed to fade away into the blue sky, never to return". He met Walt Whitman, was captivated by Matthew Arnold's writings and repelled by his person, left a prosperous business to live and write on a small annuity, came to Balliol (interesting glimpses of Jowett and others), and finally settled down to forty years' "miscellaneous reading, mostly of the lighter kind", and now, an old fogey, with no desire for eternal bliss, enjoys an "old age flowing free, with the delicious near-by assurance of Death".

A lovely picture of a row of Quaker children staring rapturously at elephants in a circus, but made to close their eyes when the acrobats in

tights appeared, remains in the mind; but even more the accounts of finds of rare books and manuscripts in the country houses of England.

Robertson Nicoll, minister at Kelso, said of a member of his congregation, "I think that girl can be useful to me". It was a characteristic remark, and one cannot help wondering what Nicoll would have done without the help of Miss Jane T. Stoddart, who, in honourable retirement, has written *My Harvest of the Years* (Hodder, 5s.). We wonder, too, what would have become of Miss Stoddart had she not given her life to the service of Nicoll and the *British Weekly;* would she have made fine contributions to letters or become a great headmistress or ——? It is useless to speculate, for never was man served as she served the minister-editor who was her hero. This book of reminiscences is about Nicoll as much as about herself: one of his dying sentences ought to make an authentic "last word", it is so fitting, "Have they plenty of copy?".

Of education in Scotland and Germany, of the day-to-day life of the journalist, of affairs in Church and State, Miss Stoddart's pages tell. Her book adds a chapter to the history of journalism, a profession which for so many years she has adorned.

In *Memory's Searchlight* (Davies, 7s. 6d.), Dr. J. A. Findlay, the veteran Presbyterian scholar, gives us, not an autobiography, but glimpses into his life in childhood and at various periods during his 75 years. Some of the accounts of travels abroad may be skipped without loss, but the early recollections and the descriptions of the life of a minister in a Lowland village and in a city church are intimate and revealing. There is a vivid chapter describing Y.M.C.A. work in France in 1917, with references to a notable interview of John Kelman with Sir Douglas Haig, showing that the Field Marshal then expected a speedy victory (unfortunately the absence of closing "quotes" disguises the end of his remarks—p. 154). Dr. Findlay has visited many parts of the world either serving his Church or during his leisure; journeys to Egypt, Palestine, Turkey, the West Indies, Canada, and S. Africa ("Smutz" looks queer) are described.

"Grey Owl's" many friends will give a warm welcome to *A Book of Grey Owl* (Davies, 7s. 6d.), in which Mr. E. E. Reynolds prints selections from Wa-Sha-Quon-Asin's writings. Mr. Lovat Dickson writes an appreciation of one who was a lover of animals and who endeared himself to many, children and adults, during his visits to this country.

Dr. A. J. Cronin calls J. B. Murphy (1857-1916), the subject of Dr. Loyal Davis's *Surgeon Extraordinary* (Harrap, 8s. 6d.), "a buccaneer on the conventional sea of American medicine". Murphy was the son of a poor Irishman, determined from boyhood to be a doctor and to leave poverty behind as soon as possible. He succeeded, for he not only became President of the American Medical Association, but he also gathered great wealth. He worked hard, but he loved the limelight and, despite his eminence as a surgeon, he was continually in trouble with the Association for his methods of publicity. In his biographer's words:

> He dramatized his personality, his profession, his patients and their ailments, his relation to his colleagues—and by such methods made the public conscious of what surgery could accomplish for them. He displayed the wares of surgery in the most attractive wrappings.

Dr. Davis's account of Murphy's achievements is highly coloured, but that perhaps is only to match the subject; three pages are given to a story of Murphy's laboratory cleaner, an indication that proportion is not always observed.

The fact that Mr. James Harpole's *Leaves from a Surgeon's Case-Book* is now in its sixth edition shows the fascination the work of a doctor has for the ordinary reading public. It will not be surprising if its successor, *The White-Coated Army* (Cassell, 8s. 6d.), is in equal demand, for Mr. Harpole can combine human interest with scientific description in skilful fashion. His cases bring out the immense strides made by medicine in recent years and show the new possibilities of healing open to medical science today.

In *The Man Who Made the Peace* (Christophers, 2s. 6d.) Mr. Stuart Hodgson presents a brief biography of the Prime Minister, a succinct account of the crisis, and a defence of Mr. Chamberlain's policy.

Had we stopped reading Mr. Collin Brooks's *Can Chamberlain Save Britain?* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 7s. 6d.) before the last two chapters—and we were sorely tempted to do so—we should have described it as hysterical pamphleteering. In its denunciation of the villain of the piece, Mr. Anthony Eden, and of Russia ("the razor-slashing Reds") Mr. Brooks raises his voice to shrieking point, forgetting his spelling to such an extent that Britain compels China to open her ports "at the mouth of the canon" (an example of muscular Christianity?) and the American Secretary of State becomes "Lancing", and making Franco's fight "a crusade, a holy war". Mr. Brooks begs the whole question in his first paragraph, when he says that one fact was beyond dispute—"Germany was ready to go to War, Britain was not". In the last two chapters, however, Mr. Brooks shows that he is capable of stating a case cogently and without passion, and even those whom he does not convince will readily admit that there is force in many of his contentions.

Miss Madeleine Kent's *I Married a German* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) tells the story of an Englishwoman who married a German teacher, a Social Democrat, in 1931. Unfortunately for the reader, though fortunately for the writer and her husband, the story ends in 1936, when the two escaped to England. The account is depressing in the extreme, not because Miss Kent has anything new to tell us in the way of Nazi brutality, but because she shows how easily Germans of the Left accepted the

> adolescent nation's sulky determination to excel in brute force if not in peaceful reform.

Starting with an affection for Germany, Miss Kent came to see that the essential German qualities uncovered by the War still remain. She has a deep sympathy with the persecuted, and speaks highly of the Jews and of the Czechs whom she saw on visits to Prague; for the German children nurtured in race hatred she has profound pity. One fact revealed in this vivid and terrible book makes us ask how far the same has been true of English Nonconformity,

> Since the Protestant pastors have been faced with definite threats against their own freedom of conscience, they have behaved with remarkable courage. But until they were attacked themselves, the great majority remained quite callous to the persecution of Jews and political suspects.

Since the removal of *their* "disabilities", have Nonconformists been as active in fighting for liberty? How Miss Kent regards the present situation may be gathered from the passage quoted in the Editorial.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since July, when Mr. Robert Mackray signed the Preface of his *The Struggle for the Danube and the*

Little Entente (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). On the title page he prints Dr. Benesh's words :

> The Little Entente is the keystone of the Central European arch without which the European order would collapse under conflicts whose consequences cannot be foreseen.

The arch has collapsed, the future will bring what it will ("Trust Hitler"), but Mr. Mackray's book, with its predecessor, *The Little Entente* (1929), remains as a record of events. He quotes a speech of Dr. Benesh some years ago :

> We are the real centre of Europe, and if Pan-German *Mitteleuropa* becomes the aim of a Pan-German movement the Czech nation will be the first to go under.

It has gone, thanks to Mr. Chamberlain, and we shall learn, in sorrow and tears, that Bismarck was right when he said that the master of Bohemia—"a fortress built by God in the very heart of Europe" he called it—was master of Europe. When the history of these years of hope and fear comes to be chronicled, students will turn with gratitude to Mr. Mackray's well-written annals. Sir Samuel Hoare becomes Sir Charles on p. 192.

Miss Vera Brittain's many admirers will, we think, find themselves disappointed with her "New Chapters of Biography", *Thrice a Stranger* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.), which tells of periods in America in 1925-1926, 1934, and 1937. Those who have visited the United States for pleasure and for business, and especially to lecture, will appreciate to the full Miss Brittain's account of her experiences in trains and hotels, on the platform, and in the hands of the interviewer. Others, however, may feel that some of the pages read much like a guide-book, and be amused at the writer's naïve delight in being a celebrity and meeting with celebrities. There are, it is true, passages where Miss Brittain proclaims her pacifism in familiar tones, and there is much interest in the conflicting demands motherhood and "career" (to use an unsatisfactory word) make on the married woman. The best part of the book is the first, where we have a vivid description of the life of a professor and his wife in a small university city. Miss Brittain's opinion of America has changed with the years; in 1925 America was an antagonist, in 1934 a friend, and now a beloved refuge to which she would gladly entrust her children. As a contribution to mutual understanding between the United States and England, the book has real value. We have, by the way, the bugbear of compositors, "immorality" for "immortality".

Volumes of children's addresses swiftly follow each other from the printing presses. The Rev. E. Ormrod Rodger gives us 38 quite good ones in *Making your Mark* (Allenson, 2s. 6d.). The Rev. J. W. James needs no commendation in this *genre;* his new volume is *The Treasure Trail*. Dr. B. Lee Woolf's nature stories, *A Breath of Fresh Air* (both Indep. Press, 2s. 6d.), will repay reproduction.

There was only one possible writer of *Mill Hill* in Methuen's "English Public Schools" series (5s.). Major N. G. Brett-James's unrivalled and intimate knowledge has given us a history which even those not educated at Mill Hill will find fascinating. It adds another chapter to the long and inspiring story of the Nonconformist contribution to education.

Although the Dean of Durham's *A Plea for a Plan* (Longmans, 5s.), dealing as it does with the curriculum of our Public Schools, concerns a comparatively few people, his lively style will appeal to a wide circle of

readers. True, his subject sometimes leads him into strange similes—"much as if no one were allowed to play cricket for England who could not prove that he had been in the football team at his private school". We should like to hear Hammond and Hutton, Verity and Voce, on their private schools! Dr. Alington has some good school stories which we must not repeat.

Dean Inge compares his weekly article in the *Evening Standard* to a pulpit. The papers reprinted in *Our Present Discontents* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.) show him to be sometimes as gravelled for matter as the preacher who has to deliver two sermons a week. Often it is otherwise, and the ex-Dean gives us his sardonic best, as when he says (not for the first time, we think),

> "One accent of the Holy Ghost the heedless world has never lost."

I should like to know where Emerson obtained this information.

In the Introduction Dean Inge liberates his soul about Spain. This is to be deplored, for he blindly accepts anything told him from the Franco side, and so instils doubts as to his merits as a historian. It is good to be stimulated, however, even if one disagrees.

Mr. R. S. Lambert's *Propaganda* (Nelson, 2s.) is one of the "Discussion Books" and right admirably does it serve its purpose, as the number of times we have desired to stop and argue a point with Mr. Lambert abundantly testifies. Mr. Lambert has a good deal of information to convey about the use of propaganda in the world of today, and the more his book is read and discussed the better. In the same series is *Psychology and the Religious Quest* by Dr. R. B. Cattell, whose writings we have previously commended. Christians would do well to weigh his argument, and to ponder his belief that

> the Churches are more likely to retrogress, through the more enlightened men leaving them, than to expand their teachings in accordance with the progress of science. . . . in America there are more scholarships for theological students than there are men to fill them; whereas the most able students in the social sciences are often unable to continue their studies.

We commend to ministers as well as to business men Sir Harold Bellman's *Capital, Confidence and the Community* (Heffer, 3s. 6d.), which contains addresses delivered in America and England. Some of them deal with the Building Society movement in which Sir Harold plays such a large part, others with various problems of economics, accountancy, business, and politics. Perhaps the most useful papers are "The Traditions of the Public Services" and "Alcohol in relation to Social Progress".

Mr. Rom Landau's *Arm the Apostles* (Nicholson & Watson, 3s. 6d.) is still another book on pacifism. He argues that while "the true Christian conscientious objection is the only logical attitude to war" nevertheless to defend Britain may be a Christian duty, because she possesses treasures which are essential to full life:

> Without this freedom all search for truth and all communion with God are impossible.

He thus sums up:

> Our negligence in the past has made us spiritually "unarmed". It has forced on us material armaments. Consequently it is our duty to support the Government in its material war preparations. At the same time, however, we must make it clear to the Government that such preparations are no more than a temporary measure and that they

should constitute only one aspect of far wide armaments. The main item in the programme of national armaments must be spiritual education and the forging of spiritual arms.

It is a sad commentary on human progress that 1938 years after the birth of Christ and twenty years after the end of the war to end war a distinguished scientist like Dr. J. B. S. Haldane should be devoting his energies to a book like *A.R.P.* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.). Combining his scientific knowledge with his personal experience of air-raids in Spain, Dr. Haldane describes adequate methods of protection and shows that the present steps taken in this country are woefully insufficient. It is a pity that the author allows his political opinions to enter a book of this kind, which can be so useful; gibes and jeers (no matter how deserved) are out of place in a work which aims at presenting a case scientifically. Dr. Haldane believes that for £400,000,000 Londoners could feel secure. It would be well that this book should be widely read and its contentions pressed upon the Government.

The Horrabin maps add immensely to the value of Mr. F. Elwyn Jones's *The Battle for Peace* (Constable, 8s. 6d.); the final chapters, which turn from a description of world-wide Nazi propaganda to a denunciation of Mr. Chamberlain's policy, detract from it. Mr. Jones's facts will come as a surprise to many, though those who know the extent and nature of Nazi control over Germans in this country will be prepared for anything. Nothing more dastardly is to be found in politics today than the control secured over German nationals abroad by threats of penalties on their relatives still in Germany. The account Mr. Jones gives of opposition to the Dictators in the Fascist States is encouraging. If his bias were less pronounced—though our own indignation is such that we have no difficulty in understanding it—the book would perhaps have been more effective. Too many misspellings mar the pages.

Mr. H. R. Shapiro's *What Every Young Man should know about War* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) consists of questions and answers drawn from war literature. The motive of the writer we cannot fathom, nor can we imagine a young man asking, "What shall I do if my enemy stabs me with a bayonet and is unable to extract it?". The answer is:

> Once a bayonet is thrust home, the skin and muscles close tightly on the steel so that a considerable effort is required to extract it. If you are still alive, ask your enemy to give his rifle a half-twist to the left. Then extraction will become easy.

The young man also asks how a war hospital would prepare his body for burial, and is answered in detail. The book has horrors enough, but the worst is Colonel P. S. Bond, who says:

> From our professional and not from a humanitarian point of view, we should look with enthusiasm to the next great war. We have developed the interesting warfare of to-day from a state of crude combat with clubs; we have made it a highly refined and delicate, if excruciating, art. In the next war we will start right, from the beginning, and it will be a wonderful fight.

"Good wine needs no bush", and the thousands who have listened and profited by Professor John Hilton's radio talks will be glad to have some of them printed in *This and That* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.). Professor Hilton is among the first half-dozen of our broadcasters; his intense sympathy for the working classes and for those suffering from any misfortune somehow

gets over the air and wins for him the respect and affection of his hearers. Long may he flourish.

> Is the torrent in spate? He must ford it or swim.
> Has the rain wrecked the road? He must climb by the cliff.
> Does the tempest cry halt? What are tempests to him?
> The service admits not a "but" nor an "if",
> While the breath's in his mouth, he must bear without fail,
> In the name of the Emperor, the Overland mail.

The Rev. George Walker's *Haste, Post Haste!* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.) has these lines of Kipling for its text. The excellent conception of the book is matched by its execution; with the aid of illustrations which really illustrate Mr. Walker tells of posts through the centuries. Brian Tuke, Thomas Randolph, William Brewster, Thomas Witherings, Ralph Allen, John Palmer, Rowland Hill—pass before us, and the adventures of post-boys, mail coaches, and packets help to make a thrilling story. Tomson, one of Walsingham's secretaries, appears as Tonson on p. 62.

Dr. Percy A. Scholes, whose vigorous defence of the Puritans against the charge of the Philistinism has won him many friends, is the editor of *The Oxford Companion to Music* (Oxford Press, 21s.). Only time and constant use can serve to estimate a volume of over 1,000 pages, packed with information; containing 179 plates, many of which carry numerous photographs; and a pronouncing glossary of over 50 pages. The *Companion* is up-to-date enough to contain an account of the Hammond organ, its proportion seems to be on the whole satisfactory, and as yet no notable omissions have been observed. Church music receives adequate treatment, articles being given to "Congregational Churches and Music", "Baptist Churches and Music", and so on. Here it might have been well to give the dates of publication of the denominational hymnbooks, and some comment on the developments they show; the organists of Union Chapel, Islington, are mentioned, but not Henry Allon. The longer articles would have benefited by lists of authorities. Special mention should be made of the frontispiece—a colour photograph of Beethoven by Batt.

Mr. John Drinkwater did not live to complete his history of English poetry, which ends with an unfinished sentence about Donne—"And the secret, so far as I can discover it, is that his thought . . . " *English Poetry* (Methuen, 6s.) contains also the Warton Lecture on English Poetry (1922) and a lecture on "Poetry and Dogma". They all show Mr. Drinkwater as a mature critic and a lover of poetry, but they reveal, too, what was not so generally known, his intimate knowledge of little-known poets: it is a pity he did not give us an anthology; but this book is a good substitute; it will give readers many a pleasant hour and at the same time lighten their darkness.

It is sad to think that we shall have no more of E. V. Lucas's essays. If some of those collected in the posthumous volume *Adventures and Misgivings* (Methuen, 6s.) do rather suggest that a column had to be filled, others are "E. V. L." at his best—and that was a very good best. Here are two of his apophthegms:

> A practical definition of "neighbour" would be a contiguous resident into whose garden one throws things.
>
> An adequate testimonial to the humour of a comedian is that line at the close of his epitaph: "He made the orchestra laugh".

All lovers of Barrie will rejoice to see *M'Connachie and J.M.B.* (Davies, 7s. 6d.), a collection of Barrie's speeches delivered on various occasions

between 1893 and 1935, and to read Sir Hugh Walpole's short but skilful Preface. Some of the speeches are "a flop"; others are Barrie at his illimitable best; that is to say the collection is "Barrie all over."

We are glad that Lord Ponsonby, our greatest authority on diaries, persisted in the scheme which issued in *The Little Torch* (Routledge, 10s. 6d.). Each page contains a diary extract—and there are 366 pages, one for every day in the year. Just the kind of book for a Christmas present.

In *The Enchanted Door* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) Miss Annie S. Swan gives us "a fireside philosophy". Round the fire she chats about life and its problems, its joys and its sorrows, drawing for illustrations on her varied experience as writer, traveller, home-maker, during the years. A book which will give joy to Miss Swan's many readers.

Ireland on £10 is one of the best of Mr. S. A. Clark's £10 series (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.). Mr. Clark has to admit that you cannot spend a whole fortnight in Ireland on £10, and Ulster is not included. The volume is as practical as its predecessors, and the "Fifty Vivid Memories" as entertaining.

Mr. Murray and the Boococks (Nelson, 7s. 6d.) shows what a great human and what a fine novelist we have lost in W. F. Harvey. In the Preface Mr. R. L. Hine gives a brief but intimate account of his fellow Quaker, and anyone who takes his advice to "step right in like the Boococks" has delight in store.

Quakers have their faults, and in *Death of a Friend* (Nicholson & Watson, 7s. 6d.) Miss Margaret Masterman pokes much fun at them, but murder among Friends must be a rarity. Perhaps Miss Lucy, the elderly Quaker spinster, will become as famous as Poirot or Wimsey—who knows? Miss Masterman takes some time to get into her stride, but the second half of the book is very good. May we suggest to the publishers that a more appropriate jacket might easily have been found?

The fact that, though we read the sketches in Mr. T. Thompson's *Lancashire Fun* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) when they appeared in the *Manchester Guardian,* we read them again with great relish, is a testimony to their quality. Mr. Thompson is unequalled in this field.

There is no doubt that Mr. H. E. Bates has the gift of powerful writing and of describing both natural scenery and episodes with colour and zest. But we wonder if the realism of *Spella Ho* (Cape, 8s. 6d.) really gets us anywhere. Time and again we were reminded of Arnold Bennett and "The Card"; Bruno is another "Card"; his squalid youth, his loss of money and power, his elemental passions, are mercilessly narrated, but *cui bono?* Even allowing for the unaccountability of the sex would a man of his type have appealed to women as varied as Italian Jenny and Virginia?

Miss Jolande Földes's *I'm Getting Married* (Nicholson & Watson, 7s. 6d.), written before *The Street of the Fishing Cat,* is well translated from the Hungarian. There is something pleasurably youthful about its freshness, and a novel in which "sex" plays no part is very welcome. Miss Földes writes fluently; her six partners are a lively crew, but she does not go very deep, and in these days of novels of a thousand pages or so this will appear slight.

Dalby Green (Duckworth, 7s. 6d.) is Mr. Walter Brierley's "best so far". He has already shown that he knows the life of the pitman and the iron that enters into the soul of the unemployed man as few know them,

and this book does not lose by lacking the squalid sexuality of its predecessors. George Bestick, discharged from the pit because he has a "business", is seen worrying as the precarious income from the shop fluctuates with chapel "custom" and competition, and finally succumbs on the advent of "the Co-op.". George, his wife and family, are all admirably drawn, and the description of life at the chapel shows that Mr. Brierley is not unfamiliar with village Methodism. A book to read.

Mr. A. S. M. Hutchinson is with us again:

> he gave Exceat, when, towering about him, he stood talking with him, the feeling, Exceat would tell him, of talking from its foot to Beachy Head.

In *As Once you Were* (Nicholson & Watson, 7s. 6d.) we have an older Mark Sabre, who in retirement acts as fairy godmother and gets into the soup—and out again.

A new volume of Mr. James Bridie's plays (Constable, 7s. 6d.—the plays can be had separately) contains *The King of Nowhere, Babes in the Wood,* and *The Last Trump*. Mr. Bridie has a sardonic wit, and makes good use of his medical knowledge, but his plays are over-sombre. A little more humour would be as leaven to them, even though the plays hold the reader. But are subjects so limited that it is necessary to resort to mental homes for Epilogues?

Hilda Vaughan and Laurier Lister's *She Too was Young* (Constable, 2s. 6d.) is the play produced at Wyndham's Theatre. Characterization good.

Had it not been for the Preface we should have thought that in his play *Victoria and Disraeli* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 3s. 6d.) Mr. Hector Bolitho was "pulling our legs". But apparently he really believes that Queen and Minister were as rose coloured as they are here depicted.

EDITOR.

Mr. Angus Armitage's *Copernicus* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.) is one of the volumes in the "History of Science Library". It is well written, and the plan of the book is good. After an outline of planetary theories before Copernicus, there is a chapter on the life of the astronomer; both chapters will be readily followed by the general reader and are of great interest. The main part of the book is an account of the Copernican system, based on the *De Revolutionibus* of Copernicus, and compared with Ptolemy's *Almagest*. Mr. Armitage's analysis of Copernicus's representation of the motion of the planets round the sun by circular motions is an instructive comparison of the old and the new astronomy, before the discovery of the elliptical paths. It is surprising how much was known with comparative accuracy about the moon, and even about the puzzling orbit of Mercury. Any one with some knowledge of geometry will not find it difficult to work through this part of the book. The interest of the book is mainly historical, but it becomes a very real interest; and the reader will finish with a feeling that the old astronomers were men of parts.

Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor's *Galileo and the Freedom of Thought* (Watts, 7s. 6d.) is a little too disputatious, and rather savours of propaganda. Apart from this disadvantage as history, the book is a very readable account of Galileo, his work, and his place in modern science. It goes at some length into Galileo's work in physics; at much greater length, as is right, into his discoveries in astronomy; and of course into the famous controversy with the Church. Much that Dr. Taylor says about Galileo's fight for freedom

of thought is of importance at the present time. In the totalitarian State Dr. Taylor sees an even greater threat to that freedom than ever the Church was in the palmiest days of persecution. There is much to be said for this view. But what seems not to occur to Dr. Taylor is the fact that dogmatic materialism has been, and still is, about as big a deadweight to freedom of thought as the modern world has known. Having said this, I want to add that Dr. Taylor's defence of Galileo is sound; and of his own love of freedom there can be no doubt.

It is almost impossible to keep up with Professor J. B. S. Haldane's books, which come one after another from the press. In his latest, *The Marxian Philosophy and the Sciences* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), he strikes a rather novel line. Scientists to-day have an urge to turn philosopher, and in this book Prof. Haldane is concerned to show that modern science is often in step with the main principles of Marxianism as it was left by Marx and Engels. This is a very big subject. Sometimes in dealing with it one feels that unconsciously Professor Haldane is seeing reflections from his own mind. The chapters on Mathematics and Cosmology, and on The Quantum Theory and Chemistry, and especially the one on Biology, are very good, and cannot fail to be of very great value to those who will master them. But as for the philosophy, that is another question. Fortunately it is possible to be a good scientist without seeing Marxianism everywhere; and Prof. Haldane is prepared to admit that the thing can be overdone. This is a book of sterling value.

New from reading Prof. Haldane's book, I came on Dr. W. Osborne Greenwood's *Biology and Christian Belief* (S.C.M., 5s.), in which the author shows that modern biology is consistent with the main Christian beliefs, and indeed points to them. So there you are. Dr. Greenwood is strongly of opinion that modern biology points in the end to some kind of creation, a Creator. The reader must settle for himself which of these two books is right. But perhaps after all we do best as scientists when we range our own field and leave the philosophers and theologians to work in theirs.

The Rev. T. Wemyss Reid's *Across the Silence* (Blackwell, 2s. 6d.) contains a series of short poems which have their origin in the great loss which came to him in the death of his wife. The poems have much beauty in them, and a depth of true and tender feeling; and they have also a poet's instinct for the beyond, for that land curtained from our sight, but near to the spirit, and perhaps only to be understood by a mystic glow on life's horizon. I am sure this little volume will bring help and faith to many who are troubled in thought and heart, and who ask those final questions which only love can answer. Loss, Mr. Reid says, is not wholly loss:

> I have learned
> How permanent is spirit and how passing
> These shadowy forms, material, of earth.
> How spirit penetrates these denser shapes
> And gives them meaning.

Mlle. de Dietrich, who is well known throughout the Student Christian Movement, has gathered together notes and meditations, chiefly upon the first three Gospels. These were originally published in French under the title *C'Etait l'Heure de l'Offrande*. An English translation is now published under the title *Behold Thy King* (S.C.M., 4s.). There is a golden thread of spiritual understanding running through this book. It is in a very high degree what a book of meditations should be; and if it represents

in some ways a type of Christian devotion more usual in the French school than in our own, it will not be the less welcome for that. Prefaces as a rule are negligible; but Mlle. de Dietrich's throws light on what follows. I would recommend this book confidently to those who are trying to cultivate the habit of meditation.

Dr. Frank Martin Hník's *The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity* (Blackwell, 16s.) has the marks of an academic thesis. It is a study of the relation of the Christian Church to social life from early times to the present day. The book is a translation from the Czech, Dr. Hník being Reader in Christian Social Ethics in the John Huss Faculty at Prague. The last two chapters deal particularly with the Czecho-Slovak Church.

A. T. S. James.

Mr. W. Romaine Paterson calls *The Passions of Life* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) "The Search for an Ideal", and the note of interrogation is very manifest throughout it. He also takes as his motto Goethe's words "all is feeling", and argues "I feel therefore I am". He is, of course, quite aware of the opposition between feeling and reason, but he believes that it can only be solved by feeling itself. In other words, our emotions rule us, and our task is not so much to regulate them as to purify them. Mr. Paterson is therefore a hedonist of a kind. To him the æsthetic is everything, and the good is the beautiful, but he gives us no clear direction as to the standard by which beauty is to be judged. On his showing it must inevitably be different for different people at different times. He has a good deal to say about religion, but religion also to him is a matter of feeling and purely subjective. He has no belief in revelation, and though he admits that religion shows progress from lower to higher forms, he gives no suggestion as to what it is that caused the progress. His treatment of the history of religion is not always well-informed, and he commits himself to the curious suggestion that the Athanasian Creed is confined within the Thirty-nine Articles. Still, there is a good deal in his book that is very suggestive, particularly when it is dealing with art and music; and it is generally interesting and always provocative.

In his Hulsean Lectures of 1936 Dr. J. M. Creed discussed the history of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ since Kant. He has now published the lectures with some additions, and *The Divinity of Jesus Christ* (Cambridge Press, 6s.) makes a very striking contribution to this most important subject. Dr. Creed passes in review all the great exponents of the subject in the nineteenth century—Schleiermacher and his followers, Ritschl and the Ritschlians, the modern Kenotists and the Barthians. He gives a brief, but quite adequate, exposition of their findings, and sums up the result of it all in the final lecture. He does not, however, make his own position as clear and definite as one would like. He realizes that the doctrine of the two natures in one person creates a quite insoluble psychological problem, and he says:

> the Incarnation is not so much a doctrine of the union of Godhead and manhood in an historical person, but rather is to be thought of as the revelation through the medium of human personality of the divine, eternal Word.

And, again,

> Historical event and historical personality have been the medium of revelation, and if the self-disclosure of God thus mediated is to be appropriated by human beings who themselves live on the plane of

> historical experience, then we require some other image to express the impact of Revelation upon the world than the parabola issuing from a mysterious beyond, to which, after a brief tangential contact with the world, it returns.

This rather cryptic statement becomes quite clear in its context, and Dr. Creed's defence of the higher doctrine it involves is one that has to be reckoned with.

The Rev. Henry Balmforth's *The Christ of God* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) is a little book on the Incarnation written for the "Diocesan Series" and intended mainly for those who have to guide study circles and teach religion in the higher forms of schools. It contains a careful discussion and defence of the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ from a definitely Anglican standpoint. Its style is simple and intelligible, and it should be quite useful for the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. G. A. Wainwright is well known as a student of Egyptian archæology. In his *The Sky-Religion in Egypt* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) he makes good use of his researches in developing a very interesting theory regarding ancient Egyptian religion. His contention is that the religion of Egypt was originally a sky-fertility cult, held in common with the Libyan and other Mediterranean peoples and dating back to a time prior to the occupation of the Nile Valley by "Egyptians." He concludes that this old religion was too deeply rooted in the popular mind to die out before such new-comers as Rê or even Osiris. The abortive effort after reform under Akhenaton was only one among many unsuccessful attempts to move away from the old faith. Mr. Wainwright brings an impressive amount of evidence in support of his theory, and his discussion of the subject will interest all students of religion as well as Egyptologists. His book makes a real contribution to the comparative study of religion.

W. B. Selbie.

A Book of Personal Religion, edited by Principal N. Micklem (Indep. Press, 3s. 6d.), is a welcome *florilegium* of Puritan devotion. The extracts are taken from Bunyan, Calvin, Doddridge, John Newton, Watts, Owen, Knox, Baxter, Edward Fisher, and Matthew Henry. Watts on "The Parts of Prayer" and "The Use and Abuse of Book-Prayers" is noteworthy, and Baxter on meditating, like Isaac, "in the eventide" is particularly good.

G. F. Nuttall.

The Rev. J. S. M. Hooper's *The Bible in India* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) describes the progress already attained "in making the Bible available for India in the various languages of the country". These "various languages" include not only the great languages of India but also minor languages which it is hard for us of the West even to remember. Yet, in spite of the number of languages surveyed, the story is so well told that interest is throughout sustained. No one who cares for the spread of the Gospel is likely to read this little book without a deepened sense of the gratitude the Church owes to those who have given themselves to the hard task of translating the Bible in India, and we hope it will be very widely read.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan's *Gautama the Buddha* (Oxford Press, 3s.) is a welcome addition to the Annual Lectures on "a Master Mind" given under the Henriette Hertz Trust of the British Academy. We have often had occasion in these columns to refer to the wide learning and graceful English style of the writer. Sir S. Radhakrishnan refuses to describe the Gautama's teaching as either "nihilism or agnosticism" and claims that "if Buddha declined to define the nature of this Absolute or if he contented

himself with negative definitions, it is only to indicate that absolute being is above all determinations". However that may be, this lecture gives an admirably lucid and concise account of the life and teaching of Gautama, and it has the added interest of being written by the most distinguished exponent of modernized Hinduism.

SYDNEY CAVE.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS

The quarter has seen some important reprints. The celebrations of the Fourth Centenary of the setting up of the Bible in parish churches has brought many new editions and translations. A new Cambridge Edition (3s. 6d. & upwards) contains the *A.V.* with Apocrypha; the Oxford Press provides a large type *A.V.* (not Apocrypha) at 7s. 6d. (superior bindings and India paper as prospectus) and also the *N.T.* in the "World's Classics" (2s.). *The Book of Books* (R.T.S., 2s. 6d.—extremely cheap) is a translation of the *N.T.* in modern paragraph form by the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson, with a few lines of introduction to each book. The Royal Society of Literature is responsible for a splendid reprint of Tyndale's *New Testament* (Oxford Press, 21s.) which gives not only Tyndale's Prefaces and Notes, but also the variants from the edition of 1525. The reprint is edited by Mr. N. Hardy Wallis and introduced by Mr. Isaac Foot. Prof. J. W. Mackail's *The Sayings of Christ,* collected and arranged from the Gospels, first printed in 1894, re-appears at 4s. 6d. (Longmans).

Prof. Powicke's Riddell Lectures, *History, Freedom and Religion,* have been reprinted (Oxford Press, 3s.).

P. T. Forsyth has a message for today, and there will be a warm welcome for the new edition of *The Work of Christ* (Indep. Press, 4s. 6d.), all the more because it is prefaced by a delightful memoir by his daughter, Mrs. Andrews.

Mr. T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral,* which drew such crowds, now appears in a new edition, the fourth, at 2s. 6d. (Faber). The cheap edition of Dr. G. G. Coulton's *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation,* first printed twenty years ago, is 12s. 6d. (Cambridge Press). Mr. E. M. Forster's delightful biography, *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson,* at 5s. (Arnold) will be snapped up. Two selections of the Religious Book Club are Miss Bowen's *Wrestling Jacob* and Dr. C. C. Richardson's *The Church Through the Centuries* (2s. 6d. to members). The two series of Mr. Gerald Bullett's anthology, *The Testament of Light,* are now 3s. 6d. each (Dent), and Mr. Claude Houghton's *The Kingdoms of the Spirit* 5s. (Daniel). Commander Stephen King-Hall's *Our Own Times* (1934) was three times reprinted. For a revised edition in one volume (Nicholson & Watson, 12s. 6d.—a remarkably cheap book) he has written a 30,000 word supplement dealing with the years 1935-1938, brought the chronology up to date, and added a new bibliography. In the "Life and Letters Series" (Cape, 4s. 6d.) we have *We Europeans,* by Drs. Julian Huxley and A. C. Haddon.

Mr. J. Langdon-Davies's *A Short History of Women* is now in an abridged and revised edition in the Thinker's Library (Watts, 1s.), and M. Jacques Bainville's *Napoleon* in Cape's "Bedford Historical Series" (7s. 6d.). Many readers will rejoice in the enterprise of Messrs. Edward Arnold, which gives them Prof. W. Macneile Dixon's Gifford Lectures, *The Human Situation,* in one volume at 7s. 6d. The Bishop of Lincoln's *The Fullness of Sacrifice,* well received in 1930, is now 5s. (Macmillan). Dr. James Parkes has revised *The Jew and His Neighbours* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.). The second edition of the Rev. D. Tait Patterson's service book,

The Call to Worship, music by Dr. Geo. Dyson, is 3s. 6d. (Carey Press). The Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. E. S. Waterhouse introduce a new edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress,* arranged for the modern reader by Mr. E. W. Walters (Duckworth, 6s.). There is also a cheap edition of Sir Arthur Eddington's *New Pathways in Science* (Cambridge Press, 5s.), and of Mr. John Oxenham's *Christ and the Third Wise Man* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.). The Independent Press has re-issued some of its recent publications: at 2s. 6d. we have Dr. S. M. Berry's *Vital Preaching,* the Rev. D. W. Langridge's *Across the Frontiers,* the Rev. T. B. Howells's *The Men of the Vatican,* and the Rev. F. H. Ballard's *The Desire of All Nations;* and at 1s. 6d. Mr. Harold Nicholson's *Give Me a Character, Sir!,* the Rev. H. G. Newsham's *Sunday Addresses on Nursery Rhymes,* the Rev. Wm. Cross's *The Carpenter's Shop in Nazareth,* and Miss Joyce Reason's *Our Fathers in the Faith.*

Miss Constance Holme's *The Things which Belong* is now in the "Fireside Library" (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Oct.). Dr. W. F. Howard writes on "Rudolf Otto and Realized Eschatology", the Rev. F. B. Harvey on "The Necessity of the Church", and Dr. Lofthouse on "Catholic and Protestant". Mr. B. L. Manning's "The Recall to Religion in the Hymns of Charles Wesley" is complementary to his article in our last issue. The Rev. G. H. Parbrook has an appreciation of C. G. Montefiore.

Hibbert Journal (Oct.). A Confessional Pastor opens with an important account of the Church Struggle in Germany. The Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas discusses "The New Protestantism" and Mr. Ray Knight "Silence as to the ministry of Jesus in early Christian Belief". There is an appreciation of Henry Sidgwick by Prof. C. D. Broad and an interesting "Philosophical Reading of Cricket" by Mr. Sreecandrath R. K. Menon.

Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). The Rev. R. G. Ramsay calls "The Means of Grace" "A Personal Confession". It is a frank and able statement of a personal attitude to the sacraments. The other articles are equally divided between general and historical.

The Layman (Oct.). A special Congo number based on Mr. H. L. Hemmens's recent visit to the Congo. The Rev. J. Ireland Hasler's article on Group Evangelism in India is important.

The Modern Churchman (Oct.). This number contains the papers read at the Annual Conference, the subject being "Modern Christian Education". The President, Sir Cyril Norwood, spoke on "The Christian Teacher and the Modern World", and the other speakers included many engaged in the work of teaching in Public and Secondary Schools and Universities. Two Congregational speakers were Dr. C. J. Cadoux ("The Educational Use of the New Testament") and Dr. Basil Yeaxlee ("The Place of Psychology in Religious Education"). The number is worth careful study. In the November issue the Editor discusses the attitude of the Bishops to Modernism.

The Expository Times (Oct.-Dec.). The October number begins the 50th year of this excellent magazine. It appears in a bright green cover; with our usual conservatism we prefer the old one! The new volume has several new series. In "After Fifty Years" Dr. Vincent Taylor deals with "The Gospel and the Gospels", and Sir F. G. Kenyon with "The Text of the Greek New Testament". In "Problems of To-day" the Bishop of Liverpool discusses "Christianity and Pacifism", the Rev. V. A. Demant "The Incarnation and Political Ethics", and Dr T. H. Robinson "The Teaching of Sin in the Modern World". Among Congregational contributors are Dr. A. J. W. Myers and Dr. Garvie.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). An excellent number. "From the House of the Four Winds" deals with Sir Robert Falconer's *Religion on my Life's Road.* Mr. Edward Grubb writes some personal experiences, and two admirable articles are Mr. A. S. Le Mare's "Society of Friends and the Modern World" and Mr. J. Roger Carter's "Peace and Economic Reconstruction".

The Christian Quarterly (October). The main article is the continuation of the Rev. James Gray's "The Sacraments and Corporate Worship", and a more one-eyed article we do not remember to have read.

International Review of Missions (Oct.). Canon Quick writes on "The Present Situation in Christian Theology". There is a searching article on "The Church in China" by Dr. T-C. Chao. Mr. S. A. Morrison discusses "Missions to Muslims", and there are two articles on Co-operative Societies—the first an estimate of Kagawa's Movement. The Rev. G. F. Allen's "Then and Now", a comparison between the young Church of the first centuries and that of today, seems to demand that the young Church must accommodate itself to the Church as Westerners know it.

World Dominion (Oct.). Several articles deal with the Madras Conference, others with the Refugee problem and the plight of the Jew. The Rev. Alex. McLeish's "Lessons of Indian Mass Movements" deserves study.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Oct.). This issue is mainly historical, three of the articles dealing with Anglo-Saxon and Medieval England. Among the other articles are "The Sator-Formula and the Beginnings of Christianity", "Ritual and Ethic" (800-500 B.C.), "A German Mystic Miscellany of the late 15th Century", and "The *Imitatio Christi*". Dr. Souter has a detailed appreciation of the new volume of the Rylands Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri.

Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.). Prof. Boettner has a 30-page study of "The Trinity". Mr. F. F. Bruce writes on the "Earliest Latin Commentary on the Apocalypse" and Dr. Zwemer on "Calvinism and Islam".

The Common Room (Nov.). The articles deal with Adult Education, and include Mr. Kenneth Lindsay's "Why Not Social Education?" and Mr. W. E. Williams's "Expanding Frontiers of Adult Education".

Social Service Review (Sept.-Nov.). Those who want to keep abreast with work done in Boys' Clubs, School Camps, Juvenile Courts, and so forth should make a point of looking at this little magazine.

The British Annual of Literature (Vol. I: 1938. British Authors' Press, 5s.). Contains prose and poetry, illustrations and competitions. The main articles deal with John Drinkwater; Dr. Douglas Hyde, the new President of Eire; and Grey Owl.

The Harvard Theological Review (Oct.). Prof. Furlani writes on "The Basic Aspect of Hittite Religion", Prof. Laistner on "Was Bede the author of a Penitential?", Mr. R. A. Dorwart on "Church Organization in Brandenburg-Prussia from the Reformation to 1740", and Prof. Finkelstein on "The Oldest Midrash".

Review of Religion (Nov.). Half this issue is given to book reviews, while the articles are Signor Alba Medea's "Vestiges of Basilian Monastic Life in Puglia", Mr. Bernard E. Meland's "Religious Awareness and Knowledge", and Mr. Peter A. Bertocci's "The Perplexing Faith of a Moralist".

Religion in Life (Autumn). A very live number. Dr. Berdyaev opens with "Marx *vs.* Man", and among the contributors who follow him are Dr. Glenn Atkins, Dean F. C. Grant, Professor John C. Bennett, Dr. W. Adams Brown, Dr. G. A. Barton, and Dr. Foakes-Jackson.

Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). The Church Congress Syllabus is continued, this quarter dealing with the "Christian Doctrine of Sin". The other articles are the Bishop of Newark's "The Need of a Teaching Ministry" and Mr. B. H. Jones's "Liturgical Discoveries of the Twentieth Century".

The Review and Expositor (Oct.). Professor R. I. Johnson's "Speech Personality in Effective Preaching" is practical, as is the Rev. G. S. Dobbins's "Facing Pastoral Problems". A lively article is Dr. A. S. Phelps's "What to do with Bill Johnson".

In Extremis (No. 5) contains a devotional study by Pastor Jean Vivien entitled *Présence de Dieu*, the conclusion of Prof. Dehn's article *Wozu wird gepredigt?*, and an address on *Die Kirche Jesu Christi u. der Student* by Brother Evgenij Lampert, a monk of the Russian Church in exile. In No. 6 Pasteur Pierre Bonnard analyses the idea of vocation as stressed by the Reformers, and Dr. Olof Gigon discusses the relations between *Christentum und Bildung*. There is also a short but stimulating study of André Gide as in revolt against the Puritanism of his youth.

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (Oct.). Dr. F. W. Padelford outlines the story of Baptist Education. Dr. J. F. Vichert discusses "The Churches and the Divinity Schools".